The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, MAY 3, 1900.

The Week.

Last week's Republican State conventions in Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, and Wisconsin show that the party still shrinks from definiteness regarding a programme for the government of our new possessions. Most interest in the platform has been felt in Indiana, as public feeling has been more stirred over the treatment of Porto Rico in that State than anywhere else, and one of the Republican Congressmen was a most earnest opponent of the tariff policy. A compromise was reached by which the convention declared, in general terms, that "we unhesitatingly endorse and approve the policy and course of the Administration, and the legislation by Congress in respect to our newly acquired possessions," and expressed "full confidence in the wisdom, integrity, and ability of the Administration, supported by a Republican Congress, to deal wisely and justly with the questions concerning the same as they may arise." Quay's convention in Pennsylvania "fully endorsed" the Administration as a whole, but said not a word on the subject of our new possessions. The Wisconsin Republicans "endorsed the strong, brilliant, and progressive Administration" of President McKinley, and declared that "we rely upon our party to deal with and solve the problems that have come to us as a result of the Spanish war, in a manner that will reflect credit upon the party, and redound to the honor and strength of the nation."

Most curiosity has been felt about the platform that was adopted in Ohio, because everybody knew that it had been approved at the White House, and was intended to "sound the keynote." This deliverance "reaffirmed the principle that the representatives of the people have full power over territory belonging to the United States," qualified only by the provision that the power shall be exercised "in harmony with, and subject to, the fundamental safeguards of our free institutions for liberty, justice, and personal rights." The claim is made for this principle that it is the one "in which the Republican party had its birth, and on which Abraham Lincoln was elected President"—although the Republican platform of 1860 was never understood by Lincoln or anybody else to imply such a doctrine as is now asserted regarding the Philippines. This "full power," we are told, should be exercised "with the most just, generous, humane, and fraternal consideration for those over whom the authority of the nation is extended"; and the convention advocated for them free schools, full security for life, liberty, and property, the most liberal measures for the development of their agriculture and industry, and the largest degree of local self-rule for which they are fitted. Meanwhile the dispatches from Manila continue to report the destruction by American forces of the schoolhouses which the Filipinos already have, the overthrow of such self-government as they have established, and the slaughter, by the score, of natives armed only with bolos, who fight for their independence against our Maxim guns.

The Philippine plank of the Massachusetts Republican platform is a distinct retreat from the position taken by the same party in the same State last fall. In October of 1899, Massachusetts Republicans breathed such a spirit of liberty in their utterances about the future of the Philippines that, as will be remembered, they satisfied so stout an anti-Imperialist as ex-Gov. Boutwell. At that time they promised for the Philippines "a government as free, as liberal, and as progressive as our own, in accordance with the sacred principles of liberty and self-government upon which the American republic so securely rests." Now they talk only of "an adequate government upon the principles of liberty and humanity," and of "establishing order and civilization in place of anarchy and barbarism." There are also fine words about our determination "not to oppress or misgovern" the Filipinos, nor to "exploit" them; and there is a recommendation that the civil-service laws be extended to the islands. This is the first appearance of such a recommendation in a Republican platform; Hanna having strangely forgotten to include it in the Ohio deliverance.

The sudden agreement of the conference committees of the Senate and House of Representatives on the amendments to the bill for the government of Porto Rico, shows that pressure was strongly applied by the Administration. The result is not only a decided victory for the House of Representatives, but also a really remarkable law regulating the granting of corporate franchises. In fact, it is doubtful if in any State in the Union, except Massachusetts, any such attempt to prevent the abuses commonly complained of has been made. In the first place, it is provided that all railroad, telephone, and telegraph franchises granted by the Porto Rican Government shall not be operative without the approval of the President. In the next place, all franchises are to be subject to amendment or repeal; shall forbid the issuing of stocks or bonds except for money or property of equal value with the securities at their par value; shall forbid the declaring of stock or bond dividends; shall provide for the regulation of charges, and for the purchase of the property of corporations by the Government. Apprehensions concerning the monopoly of land shall be quieted by the provision forbidding its acquisition by companies dealing in real estate, or by any companies except for restricted purposes; and even agricultural corporations will be permitted to own or control not more than 500 acres of land. These restrictions apply to foreign corporations, as well as to those created by the Porto Rican Government. They appear to be ample to protect Porto Rico against "exploitation" by American capitalists; and they are probably so stringent as to make the island a rather unattractive field for investors of capital in general.

The bill authorizing the President to appoint a commission to study and report on the commercial and industrial conditions in China and Japan is meeting with opposition in the House of Representatives. In the committee of the whole, on Monday, a motion to strike out the enacting clause was carried. Such a commission, as we have pointed out, is a mere embodiment of favoritism and patronage. The merchants who have extended their trade to China and Japan did not do so because of any information or advice given them by governmental commissioners, and the successful merchants of the future will not conduct their business with any reference to the views of the commissioners to be appointed under this bill. It is said that one argument used against the bill was that the work of the commission was already done by the "Commercial Museum" of Philadelphia, an institution for which Congress has heretofore made an appropriation. This museum will some time attract public attention, but it will be because of its relations to politics, not trade. Meanwhile, if its existence prevents the appointment of the Oriental Commission, it will not have lived in vain.

Secretary Root's sudden alarm about an undated attack on the Monroe Doctrine by an unnamed foe, irresistibly reminds one of the boy artist who ran sobbing to his mother with his slate, crying out, "Oh, mamma, I am so frightened at the ogre I have made!" Intellectually, such a baseless call to arms as Mr. Root made at the Grant dinner on Friday night is unworthy of him. Not even his immediate hearers could have taken him seriously. They and everybody must see that he was simply trying to fire the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

popular heart, so as to get his army bill through Congress. Such vague talk about foreign aggression, as a means of extracting more battalions from a reluctant legislature, is a very fine trick for Emperor William to resort to, but a civilian Secretary, with no process of *Majestätsbeleidigung* to prevent people from laughing at him, merely makes himself ridiculous by these manœuvres. And above all things, for Mr. Root to seize upon the Monroe Doctrine as the thing in peril! Can any foreign aggressor trample upon it more completely than we ourselves have been doing in the past two years? Is Secretary Root maintaining a force of 65,000 soldiers in the Philippines to prove to the Old World that it must not meddle with us because we have no thought of interfering with it?

Quay has lost—beaten by only one vote, it is true, but still beaten. More than once a great question in our politics has been decided by the same narrow margin, but the decision has stood as firmly as though there had been a large majority. Senators are exceedingly human, and one generation cannot bind its successor; but the late vote undoubtedly settles in the negative for a long time to come the question whether a claimant to a seat by a Governor's appointment made under such circumstances as Stone's of Quay, shall be admitted. This decision is in the public interest, as a matter of Constitutional construction. To recognize the right of an executive to fill a seat for a year or two when the Legislature might have elected but failed to do so, is to put a premium upon legislative deadlocks and intrigues between Governors and Senatorial aspirants. Such deadlocks have grown increasingly frequent of late years without the injection of this element, and it is obvious that failures of Legislatures to make a choice would happen much oftener if a shrewd wire-puller could hope to get his credentials through the Governor's aid. In this case the claimant first nominated the Governor, then kept the Legislature from electing anybody else, and finally had his agent as Executive give him credentials. Quay's defeat will greatly encourage all the forces in Pennsylvania which for years have been seeking his overthrow.

It is natural that Quay should hold Hanna most to blame for his rejection, inasmuch as the Ohio Senator's vote against admitting him as a colleague not only was a surprise to everybody, but is alleged to have been in violation of an understanding that the Pennsylvanian would have his support. All sorts of motives for this change of base are suggested, and Hanna himself probably does not expect the public to take seriously his statement that a stern sense of duty in interpreting the Constitution dictated his course. But whether it was because larger contributions were promised for the Republican campaign fund with Quay excluded from the Senate than he could guarantee if he should be seated, or for any other reason, the public will profit if Quay seeks revenge, as it is reported that he will, by blocking jobs in which Hanna is interested, like the Shipping Subsidy Bill. The trouble is that nobody can feel any confidence that Quay will "stay mad" to this extent when so many of Hanna's schemes are also zealously pushed by interests which the Pennsylvania boss has always championed.

Almost as unsavory as the beef scandal it was investigating are the itemized accounts of the commission, as lately sent to the Senate. The huge total—$105,000—is swollen by some of the most extraordinary charges which a helpless and good-natured government was ever called upon to pay. Extravagance is stamped on the surface of them all, and apparent illegality on some. It is certain that a vigilant and fearless Secretary of War—no one will think we mean Alger—would have pruned away many of the items mercilessly. But there was thought to be no bottom to the National Defence Fund, and everybody was at liberty to help himself. This pervasive spirit of extravagance is one of the evil spirits that attend on war. War is waste wholesale, and what is the use of trying to make petty economies when millions are being flung about? They are suffering in England now from the tendency to reckless expenditure which war begets. In vain does Sir William Harcourt call upon the Chancellor of the Exchequer to hold the purse-strings tighter. The money comes in freely—there was the "Chicago Smith" windfall of $4,500,000 in death duties; what are you worrying about? Yes, said Sir William, but what will you do in a year when you have a "large quantity of east-windfalls"?

Gold exports from this market to Europe have begun again. The movement is not unusual for this season of the year; in fact, a considerable shipment in April was the rule during the two decades before the remarkable change in our international balances two years ago. Even rather heavy exports would attract little attention now, but for the fact that the visible trade balance in this country's favor continues so enormous. In the nine completed months of the fiscal year, the excess of merchandise exports over imports was, it is true, $35,000,000 less than a year ago; but an export balance reckoned at $105,800,000 remained, and we have not this year, as we did in the year before, largely offset this credit by a huge import of gold. Taking together the Treasury's figures of foreign trade in merchandise, gold and silver, the apparent nine months' balance in this country's favor would be greater by fully twenty millions than in the fiscal year 1899. The seeming anomaly of a continuous rise of foreign exchange, in the face of such conditions, has led to the inference, freely expressed in many quarters, that the new bank-note issues, under the act of March 14, are beginning automatically to drive out gold.

Gov. Roosevelt has appointed an excellent commission to revise the charter of New York city. Most of the fifteen men are well and favorably known to the public, and as a body it should be capable of effective and harmonious work. The risks in such an enterprise are twofold—from mere theorists, who would want to go too far in overhauling things, and from practical politicians, who would have one scheme or another that they wish to put through. Both of these perils appear to have been avoided. There are men who have been practical politicians, but there is no reason to fear any union of them against the public interest; and there are men who have devoted themselves to theories of government and administration, but they are more than mere theorists. The situation demands wisdom and caution in making the comparatively few changes that are required, and it appears reasonable to expect this. Certainly the Governor has done his share of the work in a way that merits high praise.

Theoretically, it may appear at first thought that something is to be said for the principle of having the appraisers of estates which fall under the State inheritance tax law appointed by State authority, as is required for the counties of New York, Kings, and Erie by the bill which Gov. Roosevelt has just signed. But a little investigation shows that there is gross impropriety in having such appraisers appointed by the State Comptroller, because he must also engage counsel to prosecute estates for non-payment of taxes, so that the same official would be naming attorneys and the judges who must hear their cases. Moreover, if the State is to regulate this matter at all, it ought to regulate it everywhere—as much in St. Lawrence County as in New York, in Tioga as in Kings. The measure which Gov. Roosevelt has just made a law was purely a partisan job for the benefit of the Republican machine in the city of New York; Erie County having obviously been added to New York and Kings solely to keep the bill out of Mayor Van Wyck's hands, and all pretence of uniformity having been abandoned by leaving the other counties as before. Everybody recognized that this was a machine job, pure and simple, before Gov. Roosevelt endorsed it. He had hardly given the bill his ap-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

proval before a meeting of machine leaders was called in this city to distribute the spoils. If any theorist as to the wisdom of State selection of appraisers in the various counties had not been undeceived by the restriction of the change in the method of appointment to three out of the sixty-two counties, he must have seen his error when he read of Saturday's gathering. The boss himself had to come on from Washington to settle the squabbling.

A strike of considerable dimensions has just been terminated at Lowell, Mass., under circumstances which are creditable to all parties concerned. The strike was by the weavers in a carpet mill, who had formed a union, one of the rules adopted being that no member should weave more than two and a half cuts a day. A certain Mrs. Derrick, however, finding that she could easily do more than was prescribed, undertook to weave three cuts a day, and was therefore expelled from the union. Furthermore, the union insisted that she be expelled from the factory if she persisted in her independent course. The managers of the mill very honorably refused to deprive Mrs. Derrick of employment on any such ground as this, and after a number of days of idleness the members of the union concluded that it would be best to rescind their obnoxious ordinance, reinstate the insubordinate member, and return to work. Whatever benefits laborers may derive from their unions, we cannot include among them the discouragement to industry and ability caused by rules which limit the production of their members to the quantity which the feebler workmen can produce. Such rules are defended on the ground that employers will take the capacity of the best workmen as their standard in fixing wages, and will thus be enabled to lower the wages of the less effective laborers. But wages are not fixed by employers in this arbitrary way, and the fallacy of the argument appears when work is paid for by the piece, and not by the time spent over it.

The strike of the men employed in the shops of the New York Central Railroad at Buffalo seems to have been caused by no particular grievances. So far as now appears, the hands of the managers of the railroad are entirely clean. Only a month ago they raised the wages of the men now on strike 10 or 12 per cent., and the rate paid is as high as that prevailing on any other road. The railroad managers, however, aver that if the trouble is concerning wages, they are willing to discuss it, and even to submit it to arbitration. But if the point at issue is the control of the working force, the managers declare flatly that no discussion or arbitration will take place. They are responsible for the safety of the lives of the passengers and of the trainmen, and for the swift and safe carriage of property of enormous value; and this trust cannot be discharged if men are to be employed and discharged only with the consent of the "business agents" of the labor unions. This method of operating a railroad was once tried under the auspices of the Knights of Labor, and proved so unsatisfactory that it had to be abandoned. The locomotive engineers on the Reading Railroad, where the Knights of Labor were temporarily in control, paid very little attention to orders or to discipline. Some of them would stop their trains wherever they saw friends with whom they wanted to gossip. On the issue of maintaining rigid discipline among their employees, the managers of the Central Road will have hearty support. They ought to have as hearty support in standing out for the right of laborers who do not belong to unions, to maintain themselves without being molested for their independence. The strike bears marks of being originated by professional agitators, and it is evidently the result of prosperity rather than of poverty.

Struggling as it is under a load of debt, and compelled to retrench in every possible direction, the Spanish Government has taken a step in regard to its pensioners living in Cuba which seems hard to justify. By telegraphic orders the Spanish Consul-General in Havana was directed to suspend payment of all pensions due the widows and children of Spanish officers, resident in the island. This threatens to deprive many worthy and helpless people of their chief means of subsistence. The excuse given is, of course, that voluntary expatriation deprives these pensioners of all rightful claim on the Spanish Treasury. But established practice had hitherto allowed pensioners to live abroad, a special decree covering their case, and providing simply that they should give notice to the Government of their intention to reside out of Spain. To depart without warning from this well-known rule of procedure seems unwarranted and harsh. Loyal Spanish newspapers in Cuba, like the *Diario de la Marina*, complain bitterly of this action of the Spanish Government, which they say will bring hardship to many dependent women and children, and which is "neither just nor proper."

No higher or more impartial testimony could be given to the efficient activity of the Government of India, in the presence of the terrible famine, than was borne last week by the Indian delegates to the Œcumenical Conference. Of all denominations and of many nationalities, they declare that the Indian Government is "doing all that any Government on earth could do," and is, in fact, "achieving a greater work of rescue than any Government has ever, in the world's history, undertaken before." Yet these experienced missionaries add that the necessities of the stricken people go beyond the possible range of governmental relief, and that private charity on a large scale, intelligently directed, must supplement the work of the Government and save lives that would otherwise be lost. We are glad to see that a committee was appointed to open a public subscription in this city. There can be no doubt that, out of our abundance, a perfect willingness exists to minister to the needs of these imperilled millions, and that an organized appeal to our men of means and humanity will meet with a ready response. When the charitable of all the world are astir in this urgent matter, Americans must not sit with folded hands. We call attention to our New Haven letter on another page.

The fact has scarcely been noticed in the United States that the gold standard has been established in India, not merely in theory, but in practice, during the past year. In 1893, when the Indian Currency Commission decided to put a stop to the coinage of silver, except on Government account, it was decided that the Government would receive gold in payment of taxes at the rate of 16d. per rupee (15 rupees equal to the sovereign), and would give rupees in exchange for gold at that rate. This decision was accepted by the public as a quasi-promise to redeem the rupees in gold at that rate whenever the Government should formally adopt the gold standard. The price of the rupee in the market, however, fell to 13d., and hovered around that figure for a long time. After a while it began to rise, although the price of silver remained stationary or nearly so, at 27½d. per ounce. Last July the Indian Currency Committee, of which Sir Henry Fowler was chairman, was able to announce that the price of the rupee had risen without any artificial supports to 16d., and that more than £2,000,000 of gold had flowed into the Indian Treasury in place of, or in exchange for, rupees. In March the announcement was made officially in Calcutta that the Government had accumulated £8,000,000 of gold, and that the market price of the rupee was firm at 16d., with not more than the usual variations of exchange between countries having the gold standard. The Government announced its intention to keep a permanent gold reserve of not less than £5,000,000. It thus appears that India has "grown up" to the gold standard since 1893 without any other help than the closing of the mints to silver. This result could not have been predicted, and was not anticipated by even the most sanguine advocates of the policy adopted in 1893.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE VICE-PRESIDENCY.

It is a novel feature of the political situation this spring that, so far as the dominant party is concerned, public attention is concentrated upon its nomination for Vice-President. Nothing like this has been seen for a long time. In April, 1896, although McKinley obviously stood the best chance of becoming the Republican candidate for President, there was enough opposition to make people think only of the higher office, while the Democrats were all at sea as to their national leader. In the spring of 1892, so many Republicans were hopeful of beating Mr. Harrison for renomination that hardly anybody thought about the Vice-Presidency. Even in 1888, when Cleveland encountered no opposition within his own party, there was far less interest as to who should be his associate on the ticket than there is in the case of McKinley this year.

The Republicans enjoy unusual freedom of action in this matter now. It has become almost an unwritten law that a candidacy for President from west of the Alleghanies shall mean the nomination for Vice-President of an Eastern man, and vice versa. Lincoln of Illinois and Hamlin of Maine; Grant of Illinois and Wilson of Massachusetts; Garfield of Ohio and Arthur of New York, are illustrations of this principle in one party; and in the other, McClellan of New Jersey and Pendleton of Ohio; Seymour of New York and Blair of Missouri; Cleveland of New York, and, in succession, Hendricks of Indiana, Thurman of Ohio, and Stevenson of Illinois. Only twice has this rule been broken. The desire for a war Democrat from a border State caused an exception to the principle when Johnson of Tennessee was nominated with Lincoln in 1864, and the division of Eastern support between Wilson of Massachusetts and Fenton of New York in 1868 enabled Colfax of Indiana, then at the height of his popularity, to become Grant's associate.

The motive of such action has been two-fold—first, a regard for considerations of locality, which formerly were more influential than they have been of late years; and, secondly, a desire to strengthen the ticket by conciliating a disaffected faction or by winning the support of doubtful men through their faith in the candidate for Vice-President. McKinley was greatly benefited four years ago by the choice of Hobart, a New Jersey man who was a far better representative of sound financial principles than his chief, and who secured for the ticket a degree of confidence among the business men of the East which was much needed. In 1876 and again in 1884 the Democrats were much helped by the selection of Hendricks as the associate of Tilden and Cleveland. It was always hard for the people of other States to comprehend the causes of Mr. Hendricks's great popularity and personal strength in Indiana, but there was no doubting the fact, and each of the New Yorkers profited by it.

This year an Ohio man is to be renominated for President without any opposition, and the party does not need to consult Eastern sentiment regarding his associate. In the spring of 1896 it was evidently desirable, if not essential, to have a candidate for Vice-President who would strengthen the ticket in New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut. In the spring of 1900 only the most timorous of Republicans fear the loss of any one of these three States, and only the most reckless of Democrats suppose that Bryan will get an electoral vote in this part of the country.

There is no Western State which pushes a candidate of any particular strength. Indiana seems likely to be the most closely contested, but the Republicans have no Hendricks. Senator Fairbanks has been suggested, but he is the sort of rich man who runs better in a Legislature which has to elect a Senator than in a contest at the polls. Michigan, Illinois, Wisconsin—in short, all the States in the Middle West—may be gone through without discovering a Republican who has such personal strength at home and in his section as Colfax possessed in his prime. Iowa Republicans resent the notion of one of their ambitious young leaders being taken for Vice-President, because they think that it would mean the refusal of the Speakership to Gen. Henderson in the next House, on the ground that one State should not have the presiding officers of both branches, and they are not willing to trade what they consider the larger office for the smaller.

The only candidate anywhere who is really popular is Roosevelt. A great many Republicans in the West evidently would like to see him on the ticket, and there are signs that some of the party managers think he would be the strongest man they could find. The Republican machine in this State has encouraged the movement, in order to get him out of the Governorship. But he does not want the place, and the effort to force him into it has been overdone. The schemers have gone so far as to say that the ticket needs to be strengthened in order that McKinley may be sure of re-election, and this is a reflection on both the President and the party. Neither wishes to confess such fear of Bryanism, and only such confession would excuse the thrusting of a nomination upon a man who does not want it.

Under these circumstances there is no reason why the best man available should not be picked out without regard to locality. The Massachusetts Republicans on Thursday proposed John D. Long, laying stress upon "his brilliant and successful administration of the affairs of the navy." As Legislator, Governor, Congressman, and Cabinet Officer, Mr. Long has served the public with distinction. Moreover, he can be thought of as a possible President without provoking a smile, which is a thing to be considered, although it is not always taken into account. The Republicans did not need to nominate a Massachusetts man for Vice-President in order to carry the State, twenty-eight years ago, and they have still less need to do so for that reason now. But a better candidate, from the party point of view, than Secretary Long, it would be difficult to designate, while his steady adulation of his chief should make him *persona grata* to President McKinley.

THE CONVICT LABOR PROBLEM.

A bill was passed by the New York Legislature in its closing hours which threatens to break up the system of employing convicts at remunerative labor. At a hearing before Gov. Roosevelt last week, the bill was explained and advocated by the representatives of certain manufacturers of Buffalo, who had procured its passage. The measure authorizes school trustees to buy desks and furniture not of prison manufacture. As a matter of fact, more than one-half of the school furniture bought during the last year was not made in the prisons. This is explained as due to the inability of the prison authorities to supply the demand, and it is asserted that better furniture can be bought of private concerns at lower prices than are asked by the State. It was further alleged that the present law, which requires the purchase of prison-made goods, so far as practicable, by public institutions, had thrown out of employment four hundred workmen formerly connected with a furniture manufactory at Buffalo.

Gov. Roosevelt objected that, if exception was made in favor of furniture-makers, other manufacturers would demand that similar exceptions be made in their favor, with the result of nullifying the whole scheme of convict labor. To this it was replied that the National Guard had already obtained exemption from the statute. The members of the Guard, it was claimed, felt degraded by being compelled to wear prison-made uniforms, and similar prejudices on the part of school-children ought to be respected. This argument appears to be entirely valid. There is no reason why the sentimental objections of soldiers should be regarded any more than those of school-children, or of any other class of persons, outside of the penal institutions, who are furnished with supplies at the public expense. There should be no discrimination allowed, for if it was allowed in one case, it would certainly be demanded in others.

Singularly enough, the bill in question was opposed by the Commissioner of Labor Statistics, who is a representative of the labor-unions. He asserted that

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the bill would be the entering wedge in the destruction of the present system of convict labor. It would deprive the prisoners of employment, and leave the State with a quantity of expensive machinery on its hands. It was intimated that the Buffalo establishment, which is the only one in the State engaged in the manufacture of school furniture, was a member of the "School-Furniture Trust," and that improper means had been employed to procure the passage of the bill by the Legislature. This is not improbable, but such considerations are irrelevant to the main issue, which is simply the maintenance of the system of employing prisoners adopted by the Constitutional Convention of 1894. If such bills as this are passed, that system cannot endure.

The system, it will be remembered, was adopted against the judgment of prison experts, in order to propitiate the labor-unions and the manufacturers of certain kinds of goods who were jealous of the competition of the prisons. The compromise accepted forbade the sale of prison-made goods in the market, but authorized the employment of convicts in the production of such articles as are used in public institutions. It is quite conceivable that if no political, or partisan, or personal considerations interfered, all the convicts in our prisons might be usefully employed. They could earn enough to support themselves, and the public institutions could utilize all their products. However this may be, the Constitution prohibits the employment of convicts in any other form of productive labor. If they are not allowed to make goods to be used in the public institutions, they cannot make goods at all. They must either be maintained in idleness, or employed in labor which produces no return, and the taxpayers of the State must provide their support. For good or ill, the Constitution has limited their employment to labor for the public account, and to cut off this sole resource would be extremely disastrous.

It need not be assumed, however, that the present system works well. No one familiar with the proceedings of the Legislature and with the character of the men who obtain office under the State Government, expected that it would. It was predicted that the convicts would be locked in their cells in idleness a large part of the time, and that the managers of public institutions would take little interest in making prison industries successful. These predictions have been verified. The last report of the Prison Association contains the result of investigations made at the State prisons at Sing Sing, Auburn, and Dannemora. A fair showing was made by the Auburn prison, although even there a number of prisoners were idle, and the day's work was from four to six hours. At Sing Sing the men were not working more than four hours a day, on an average, and not doing more than three hours' work in that time. At Dannemora there was even more idleness. The excuse given was everywhere the same. There was no demand for prison-made goods on the part of the other public institutions of the State. In fact, it was alleged, the authorities of these institutions would not buy prison-made goods unless they were compelled to.

On the other hand, considerable evidence was given showing that many of these authorities were entirely willing to carry out the law, but were prevented by the incompetency of the State officials. The goods were described as, on the whole, satisfactory in quality, but as held at higher prices than those prevailing in the market. There is not the slightest excuse for this. The State does not have to make a profit on its sales, and it would involve no loss to the community were public institutions supplied with prison-made goods free of charge. It would simply be transferring money from one pocket to the other. The evidence shows that, but for the grossest incompetency, the convicts might be now quite fully employed, at classified industries, and that their produce might be disposed of to public institutions at rates that, under the circumstances, would be fairly remunerative. The need of reform in the business management of prison industries is urgent, but such measures as that which Gov. Roosevelt is asked to sign only make reform more hopeless.

MUNICIPALITY AND SLUMS.

The appointment of a new commission to study the tenement-house problem will reawaken public interest in the question. Mr. de Forest, the chairman of the body, represents what is doubtless the prevailing feeling among its members when he says that they have no cut-and-dried plans, and propose to have a thorough investigation before making any recommendations. Such an inquiry will, of course, take account of what has been done elsewhere, both in this country and abroad.

Probably the most wisely planned attack yet made upon the tenement-house evil has been that of the London merchant, Charles Booth, who fifteen years ago turned a part of his warehouse into a statistical office, and proceeded to present the truth about the poverty of the city with much of the accuracy and exhaustiveness of a ledger account. The effects of Mr. Booth's investigations well illustrate the compelling power of ascertained facts. They influenced the preparation and passage by Parliament of the epoch-making Housing of the Working Classes Act of 1890, which provided for the demolition by public authorities of houses unfit for human habitation; and, if it were deemed advisable, the erection of new and suitable dwellings upon the areas made vacant. The first of these powers, in pursuance of English precedent, has since been incorporated into the legislation of New York State and of Massachusetts.

In London the principal outcome of the Act of 1890 has been the removal by the County Council of a mass of closely huddled cottage structures covering fifteen acres of territory in Bethnal Green, and the erection upon this area of a unique municipal tenement-house village, ingeniously designed so as to secure a reasonable amount of light and air for 6,000 people. The last of these "Boundary Street Buildings," as they are called, was formally opened a few weeks ago by the Prince of Wales. In two other London districts similar undertakings have been entered upon.

Such schemes had been anticipated long before by Glasgow and Birmingham. As early as 1866 the Town Council of Glasgow was constituted an improvement trust for purchasing and making over slum property, and the policy of demolishing unsanitary tenement-blocks has been persistently followed ever since. Only a few tenement-houses have been built by the Council, but the city has entered actively and successfully into the business of providing model lodging-houses. Birmingham, under the lead of Joseph Chamberlain, took up the example of Glasgow in 1875, but went much further. Ninety acres of congested territory were purchased, upon which stood 1,867 dwellings and 814 other buildings. About half the buildings were demolished, the rest were put into sanitary condition. The whole scheme will in a few years from now be upon a paying basis; and about 1950, when the leases fall in, all the improvements upon the cleared area, including many of the finest business blocks in the city, will become municipal property.

New York, as a result of the work of the Tenement-house Commission of 1894, had, before the return of Tammany, fairly entered upon an aggressive policy similar on its negative side to that of the British cities. This policy was embodied especially in the law of 1895, authorizing the Board of Health to order the removal of unsanitary dwellings, and in the stimulus given to the movement for small parks. It is doubtful whether American conditions will demand that the municipality itself enter upon building operations, especially while our city governments are as they are. But it is to be hoped that the newly appointed commission will give the strongest momentum to such bold but far-sighted effort as has already wiped out thick and reeking slums in Mulberry Bend and Hester Street.

The time has come for a serious taking account of stock as to the tenement-house question in this city, such as will be at once comprehensive and minute. Single great undertakings are

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

locally useful, and are suggestive as to the future. The testimony of persons with special experience may serve as a general guide to the commission in formulating a policy. But there is needed a scheme of continuous statistical study of the tenement-house life of New York, especially since it presents a problem more complicated and intense than that of any other city in the world. Only in that way can effort toward the solution of the problem pass from the stage of scattered, spasmodic impulses into the stage of adequate and effectual action, guided by the light of science. If, for instance, the statistical truth were available, showing by precincts, blocks, and individual houses the bearing of tenement conditions upon mortality, disease, pauperism, and crime, we could fasten directly upon the cause of incalculable loss to the city in the expense of its public institutions, and in the waste of the productive capacity of its people.

In Berlin, a degree of minuteness in the collection of facts which might at first seem to the practical American sense absurd, has been the means of discovering the most threatening housing evils. It was found that families living in one room, though constituting but one-eighteenth of the population of the city, registered nearly one-half of the entire number of deaths. Their yearly death rate was 163.5 in 1,000, or about one person in every six, while for families living in two rooms the death rate was 22.5, and for three-room families it fell as low as 7.5. These results, as may be supposed, at once led to specific and drastic regulations as to light, ventilation, air capacity, and overcrowding.

In 1890 the Massachusetts Bureau of Statistics of Labor made a tenement-house census of Boston. One section of the census had to do with the sanitary condition of tenement-houses, classified by small subdivisions of wards throughout the city. The report showed that 522 families were living in houses which were beyond doubt unfit for human habitation. This census prepared the way for a thorough-going policy of extermination against the worst slums. The attack has reached its climax since 1897, when the law was passed empowering the Board of Health to order the removal of objectionable dwellings. During the last two years 156 houses have been ordered demolished, and, in the cases of nearly all, the ground has been cleared. It is of interest in connection with the cessation of such activity in New York, in part because of suits brought by expropriated landlords against the city, that no such resistance has been offered in Boston. An average sum of $50 is paid to the landlord by the Board of Health in each case, and usually the land has proved to be worth as much, after the outworn building was removed, as before, if not more.

TAXATION OF COLLEGE PROPERTY.

The question of the taxation of college property continues to crop out in State legislatures with frequency enough to indicate that the matter is not yet regarded as settled. The Legislature of Massachusetts has lately had an interesting debate on the subject, in which the arguments pro and con were presented with considerable vigor; but a motion to substitute for an adverse committee report a bill providing for the payment by the State of the taxes assessed upon literary and scientific institutions, was lost in the House by the decisive vote of 49 to 63, which was increased on a roll-call to 51 to 128.

While the recent decision of the Massachusetts Supreme Court in favor of Harvard College, certain of whose property the city of Cambridge sought to tax, must be held to have settled the legal status of the matter in that State for the time being, the subject is not, of course, beyond the reach of further legislation. There can be no doubt that a considerable number of persons, themselves friendly to the colleges, are inclined to think that the policy of exemption has been carried too far, and that some portion, at least, of the extensive property now held by educational institutions might well be levied upon for the support of government. The arguments in support of this contention have not, so far as we have observed, changed much of late. It is denied that a college is of any peculiar importance to a community, or that the fact that it spends, directly or indirectly, large sums of money annually in the town or city entitles it to any more consideration than is accorded to great manufacturing establishments. The phenomenal growth of colleges and universities in the past generation has been accompanied by a great increase in the value of the real and personal property held by them. It is claimed, further, that colleges not infrequently buy and hold real estate for speculative purposes, or that they devote some part of their exempted realty to the conduct of ordinary business, as in the case of the Harvard Coöperative Society.

There is, undoubtedly, much force in these arguments. The modern college is less the quiet place of learning which it once was, than a great business enterprise. On the other hand, there is much to be said in rebuttal. In speaking the other night at Wellesley, President Eliot of Harvard, who has done more than any one else to formulate the case for the colleges, called attention to the many ways in which Harvard contributes to the support of the community, and pays for the privileges and exemptions which it obtains. The college contributes like any private citizen or corporation to the maintenance of gas, electric light, and water companies. It pays its share of assessments for sidewalks, sewers, and highways. It pays taxes on the several million dollars' worth of real estate, in Boston and Cambridge, held by it as an investment, and it must deduct from legacies and bequests a substantial percentage for the support of the government of the United States. So far as its "business" is concerned, however, the college has nothing from which it can pay taxes. It has no salable product, and produces nothing which has immediate pecuniary value in itself. No student pays to the college anywhere near as much as it costs the college to educate him. As to the "burden" which the presence of an institution with a large amount of exempted real estate is said to impose upon a community, President Eliot asked whether Boston Common is a burden on the city, and whether anybody living in Boston would exchange the Common for a group of ordinary houses and stores. He raised the further question whether a public reservation is a burden on the community where it exists, and pointed out that, if it is, the people of Massachusetts have been engaged in a very extraordinary process during the last ten years, as they have been providing themselves with such reservations at a great cost all about the State, and particularly in the metropolitan district. Not only is a public reservation not a burden, but it is a clear advantage to the community. Dr. Eliot applied the same test to the square on which Bunker Hill Monument stands, and the ground on which the State House stands, only to reach the same conclusion.

It seems to us that the real point at issue in the matter of taxing college property has changed somewhat in recent years. On the whole subject of exemptions, whether educational, charitable, or religious, there have long been, and will probably long continue to be, two diametrically opposite views. The practical question now is, rather, whether the benefits of the college are any longer so far localized that the town or city ought to bear the entire burden of exemption, whatever that burden may be. There can be little doubt that towns like Brunswick in Maine, Hanover in New Hampshire, Amherst and Williamstown in Massachusetts, are rendered many degrees more attractive, more desirable as places of residence, and consequently of higher assessed valuation, because of the presence of colleges in them than they would ever have been without. But should the whole burden of exemption fall upon the town? It was around this point that much of the debate in the Massachusetts Legislature the other day turned.

The practice of Maine is instructive by way of answer. Until 1889, property in that State held and used for educational, philanthropic, or religious purposes enjoyed the exemption usual elsewhere. In 1889, however, it was provided that, while the exemption should continue to

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

extend to the personal property of all literary and scientific institutions, and the real estate occupied by such institutions for their own purposes, or by any officer thereof as a residence, any college having real estate liable to taxation should thereafter be entitled to have the amount of such taxes reimbursed from the State Treasury, to an amount not exceeding $1,500 in any year. The claim to reimbursement was not to apply to real estate purchased after the passage of the act. Under this law the colleges retain, unimpaired, the income from their real and personal property, while the community has also the privilege of taxing certain specified parts of it. In other words, the Maine statute recognizes that the benefits of the college are not localized, but diffused throughout the State; and that, while they may well be acknowledged by actual exemption from taxation, the burden of such exemption should be borne by the State. Whatever its theoretical value, the plan has the merit of being a satisfactory practical adjustment.

THE FAMINE IN INDIA.

NEW HAVEN, April 25, 1900.

Two aspects of the present famine in India have received constant attention from well-meaning writers in the daily press. If the observations of these philanthropists have not been profound, they have at least been meritorious, in keeping before a light-hearted public this distressful subject. But now that the time has come to act on the many suggestions offered, it may be well to inquire what without prejudice is best to be done and how to do it. The second question, that of the origin of the famine, is at this time quite secondary, but as it has not only been mooted, but been made a pivotal point of attack on English methods in India, this aspect also deserves attention, especially as it may influence contributions to the relief fund.

First, however, for the matter of greater moment. The clerical editor in Kansas who, though advised against the measure, persuaded the farmers of that State to ship corn to India, undoubtedly thought he knew what was best for the country. Others have followed suit. More corn is to be sent. What good will it do? If these benevolent persons would follow up their generous gifts, they could easily satisfy themselves of the comparative futility of their efforts. Expert advice has not been lacking, but it has been ignored. What are the simple facts? Corn shipped now cannot possibly be landed in India before the monsoon rains set in early in June. When landed, how is it to be distributed? Apart from the delay, apart also from the freight charges, which will have to be paid for shipping, there is another consideration. Let us imagine this corn actually landed and sent up country to this or that missionary. How is the missionary in turn to distribute it? One of the chief causes of present and future distress is that the cattle, also starved, have died. Now all country transportation is by bullocks. Imagine the good missionary with a car-load of corn dumped at his door. How is he to get it to the outlying villages, which lie far from the rail, with no bullocks to drag the load? Even if the rains do not come, he will be unable to handle it; but if the monsoon breaks at its appointed season, the roads will be impassable, be the cattle few or many. Further, in the hot damp of June half this unprotected grain will rot and be unfit for use. Finally, and this has been repeatedly urged into the deaf ears of our sapient philanthropists, there is no lack of grain, there is no scarcity of supply in India. Food is there in abundance—not Indian corn, which the peasants do not know how to use, but their own grains, rabi and jôwari, with which they are familiar.

Why, then, are the peasants starving? For the plainest reason, because they have no money to buy this grain. It is held by merchants, who have enough for the multitude, but will not give it away; nor may the Government compel them to do so or connive at looting it. If any charitable folk will help the natives of India, and great indeed is their need, let them cable money, not send corn. Cash can be cabled at once. Within a few days it is in the hands of the remotest agent or missionary. In a few hours he can turn it over to the villagers, and the latter have but to take it to the local grain merchant (no village is without one) and supply their wants. These are the common-sense facts of the case. They were foreshadowed three years ago when the local grain-merchants shut their granaries and the people starved at their doors, while American corn was slowly sailing across the ocean. What the people want is money. Money cabled now can at once be converted into grain, of which, we repeat, there is plenty. Corn shipped now will arrive too late, and half of its usefulness will be gone before it is distributed. Of course, the corn will not all be wasted. Eventually it will do some good. Had it been sent four months ago, it might have been of great service, whereas now, as was the case with much of the corn sent in 1897, its main use will be to provide seed for another year. But what is required now is not seed for next winter's harvest. Money with speed is needed to save thousands who otherwise will not live to plant again.

This is the vital question and its answer. To inquire what caused the famine seems almost irrelevant at this time, but there are those who hold England responsible for the famine, and, strange conceit of Christian sympathy, would let the sufferers die rather than aid where England has erred. But let us consider what error there has been.

Three years ago there was a great scarcity, or a little famine. Sensational papers called it a great famine, but they know better now if they did not then, for it was nothing in comparison with the present scourge. Both, however, are due to exactly the same cause. This is neither the establishment of a gold standard, as is maintained by the Spokane *Chronicle* and other Western papers of that ilk, nor the deliberate infliction of famine by the Government, as Anglophobia, in the shape of some of the Eastern dailies, incoherently charges. Drought is the cause. Whenever the monsoon rains fail and the winter showers also fail, there will always be a famine as long as the Hindu *ryot* remains what he is by nature and through inherited inability to escape the moneylender. The peasant works hard, but he is always in debt. Not only can he not save, but he will not. When times are prosperous, he lives as easily as he can; when bad times come, he is unprepared, now as always.

The only difference between the past and the present is that in the old days the peasants died uncared for. To-day help is offered them on Government relief-works, where, if there are not too many applicants, they may earn food. Formerly there were no such works; the native princes left their subjects to die. The great irrigation works were also unknown, and every statement to the contrary is based on ignorance. Irrigation was known, and here and there tanks were built by native rulers. But these tanks dried up in the first drought, and the only irrigation known was that of rill-irrigation by farmers for their own benefit. Let the doubter go to-day to the Punjab, where formerly at every famine the peasants died like flies, and what does he find? An arid desert converted into a grain-raising country by means of immense works which drain the huge rivers of the Punjab and distribute life-giving streams over a vast area. He will find the same system introduced by the Government on the Ganges. But India is a large country, and famine spreads faster than irrigation can follow.

No sillier lie has ever been published than the statement repeatedly made in the daily press that famine was unknown before the advent of British rule. The literal truth is, that famines lasting for years are chronicled through all the centuries of Hindu and Mohammedan rule, and that no adequate public relief was given. This was due partly to inability, partly to indifference. Again, it is said by our local sages that the peasant is now so heavily taxed that he cannot meet famine when it comes, whereas of old he was left a competence. Another historical blunder. Under Mohammedan and Mahrathi rule the peasant was "taxed" by being robbed systematically. Between raids he was free, for every raid left him plundered of all he had. By the time he recovered from the first "tribute," however, the genial Mahrathi held a knife to his throat again, asking for his concealed wealth. This was the constant state of the Hindu peasant. When there was no famine, he was bled, figuratively and literally. When famine came, he was left to die. Even when he was not raided, it is notorious that the land revenue was collected with the greatest rigor under native rule. If the peasant could not or would not pay (under torture), he and his family were sold into slavery. In times of famine things were still worse; men sold themselves for a single meal.

Slowly this has changed under the British Râj. To-day, in the permanently settled tracts, the land revenue represents on an average about one-twenty-fourth of the gross value of the produce. Out of ninety-nine millions revenue (Rx. = Rupees ten) in 1898-1899, the land tax was only twenty-seven and one-half millions. In 1896-1897 seven and one-half millions (Rx.) were spent on famine relief outright, the whole cost of the famine being fourteen millions. Nearly two millions were lost to the revenue through suspending taxes altogether, while one and a third millions were loaned to cultivators. To-day there are over five millions of people supported at Government expense. When did ever a native government assist its subjects in this manner?

Papers that prate of the Famine Relief

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Fund, and ask where it has gone, must be lamentably ignorant of the fact that there is no such fund, save as it is taken out of the surplus in prosperous years. The last little famine exhausted the surplus, and left a deficit of five million, but in 1898-1899 thirty-three millions were spent on famine relief (still necessary), building and railroading, all of which are provided for as part of the legitimate expenditures of the so-called fund. And a most praiseworthy feature is this building of railways, for it is a prophylactic against future famine in districts hitherto far out of reach of help.

Centuries of oppression have left the peasant helpless and improvident. The native usurer is his refuge in time of trouble. His grain goes chiefly not to pay the land-tax, but to buy a mortgage and keep the usurer quiet. For the expenses of a wedding or a funeral he will cheerfully double this same mortgage. And he pays 180 to 300 per cent. interest, not on the sum loaned, but on this sum with a cipher added, which the usurer knows how to tuck on and the peasant is too ignorant to discover. No government can put the peasant in a position where a three years' drought will not bring him to the edge of starvation. There he stands to-day, poor wretch, waiting for money with which to buy life.

WASHBURN HOPKINS.

VANISHING LONDON.

LONDON, April 6, 1900.

Few people, even Londoners—or, perhaps, Londoners less than other people—realize how entirely the character of London is changing. The growth of the metropolis, the pulling down and putting up, the constant improvements of the last few years, are of a kind usually associated with the go-ahead cities of America or South Africa, rather than the most conservative capital in the world, that is just awakening to the advantage of electric light and traction. The Englishman, if he were told, as I was the other day by an American fresh from a journey through the Western States, that nowhere was there such a fury of building and rebuilding as in London, would probably be as surprised as he is when the foreigner ventures to suggest that the suppression of evidence at the Jameson trial was, after all, not much more creditable than the suppression of evidence at the Dreyfus trial!

But if the Londoner does shut his eyes to the facts before him, there can be no question that, gradually, old landmarks are disappearing and a brand-new town springing up. I say nothing of the Embankment and the changes in the City; they are older than my personal acquaintance with London. I say nothing of the spreading out of the suburbs; it is impossible to keep pace with them. I simply look back to the London I came to sixteen years ago, and compare it with the London of to-day. Then, between Oxford Street and the Strand—as I remember to my cost, for I lived in Bloomsbury—there was but a network of narrow alleys and twisting streets; and Seven Dials, though somewhat reformed since Dickens's description, could still be seen in all its labyrinthine glory, or squalor. Now, the two districts are connected by two wide thoroughfares, Shaftesbury Avenue and Charing Cross Road, and, judging from the grime on the houses that line them, the newcomer to London could never imagine both streets had been opened, virtually, but yesterday. I have seen the beginning and completion of a third, Rosebery Avenue, leading through the wilderness to Islington, of a third, a fourth, still further afield. But to give a list of them all would be to fall into cataloguing, and my object is to point out chiefly what is going on in the very heart, the very centre of London.

When I came, almost the only houses of modern flats—the old-fashioned chambers of the Inns of Court and their neighborhood are a very different matter—were in Victoria Street, that dark, dingy, narrow valley where few men could preserve their cheerfulness. Now, there are apartment-houses, or mansions, on the Embankment looking out upon the river, everywhere in Mayfair and Belgravia, in the little streets leading from the Strand, in the quiet, dignified squares of Bloomsbury, which, though never of any great architectural distinction, had a certain stateliness, a certain air that these tall, gingerbread, jerry-built barracks are fast destroying. In Kensington, in Chelsea, even in St. John's Wood it is the same story; the big, ugly modern contrivances shoot up of a sudden in the streets that Thackeray and Carlyle knew and loved, and all the old character goes from them for ever. There is no use in protesting. The modern flat is by far too useful and often admirable an invention. Only once was a protest made and heard—when, a few years ago, a private company was asking Parliament for the right to fill its shareholders' pockets by turning the river front, beyond the Houses of Parliament and that beautiful little old corner of Westminster just back of the Abbey and the Dean's Yard, into a checker-board of mansions. But, as a rule, the gain in comfort so outbalances the loss in picturesqueness that opposition would seem as foolish as Ruskin's crusade against the railroad.

But when it comes to really the greatest innovation of all, one cannot look on quite unmoved. One accepts with equanimity the widening of the lower end of Parliament Street, now in progress, for, as it was, the street was too new to have the sanctity of association, and the Houses of Parliament are worthy of the noble approach hitherto denied them. On the Strand, however, one is on holy ground. It may not be as old as Fleet Street or Holborn, it may be without the old City limits, but it is old enough—"the ancient Strand," Mr. Henley calls it—to be one of the best-known streets by name in Europe or America. Whoever has heard of London has heard of the Strand; whoever loves London loves the Strand. In some ways it has changed enormously. The palaces that Pepys passed on his way to Whitehall have gone; there are hardly any buildings left that Dr. Johnson would recognize—only the two churches that stand in the middle of the road and obstruct the traffic. But, in its main characteristics, it remains as it has been during many long generations. It leads to the City—that is, to the busiest, wealthiest, most powerful business quarter there is the world over, and it is still as mean in its proportions as the High Street of a sleepy country town. It is one of the very few direct lines of communication between East London and West, and the route of endless omnibuses. During the day, it is thronged by an army of business men and clerks hurrying to and from work; in the evening, by an army of theatre-goers, and yet it is still so narrow that the best-trained police to be found anywhere cannot prevent a ceaseless succession of blocks. It is shabby beyond words; its shops are shabby, its houses are shabby, its theatres are shabby, the people who crowd it seem shabby in sympathy. It is, in fact, as absurd a street as you could imagine. But then, it is the Strand, and no lover of London would have it otherwise. It is as characteristic in its way as are the Boulevards of Paris or Unter den Linden of Berlin.

And now, the Strand—the ancient Strand—is doomed, though the name no doubt will survive. It has been easy to see that for long the County Council has had the evil municipal eye upon it. The slightest chance or excuse to widen it has been greedily seized. Already, before the Hotel Cecil and at the corner of Wellington Street, where there is such a mass of cabs and carts and 'buses going to and coming from Waterloo Bridge, the old line of frontage has been abandoned, and the space saved thrown into the roadway. But, to-day, whoever walks on eastward will see that all along the northern side of the street there is a wall of scaffolding, behind which houses, one after the other, are tumbling. From the Gaiety Theatre to the Law Courts, from St. Mary-le-Strand to St. Clement Dane's, the work is busily being pushed that will transform the Strand as one knows it into a street as like the streets of any other big town as possible. For a time there was talk even of Wren's churches going. But the County Council, to give it its due, is not a bigger vandal than it can help. Has it not just taken over as a public monument the old house in Fleet Street that passes without any reason for the "Palace of Henry VIII. and Cardinal Wolsey," and really does date back to the reign of James I.? And so, fortunately, it has been decided to spare the churches; they can be used as safety islands to divide the two streams of traffic; and they will leave to the Strand what little distinction it can hereafter boast. But think what is to go. In the first place, the character of the street, which counts for so much nowadays when Budapest is but an eastern Chicago on the Danube, and Rome but a southern Paris in the Campagna. Already, Mr. Nutt, whose shop was a rendezvous for scholars of all nations, has flown to Long Acre. Behind the scaffolding is Holywell Street, the old lair of the seedy, whiskey-drinking, always-in-debt, now out-of-date journalist, the haunt of the book-collector and lover, where rare bargains have been picked up—among others, bound with an insignificant tract, that little Elzevir cook-book said to have sold once for £600 at a sale—Holywell Street of unsavory reputation, but picturesque, with its gables and overhanging stories, one of the few genuine bits of old London. And Holywell Street is not to be merely rebuilt; it is to be destroyed. And so is gabled Wyck Street. And in the course of a few years, with all the haste of County Councillors eager for reform, an irreproachable boulevard from Holborn will just about here meet the Strand, and electric trams—think of electric trams near the Strand!—will whirl away the business men and the clerks and the theatre-goers. And, no doubt, it is a mere question of time before the same transformation will follow in the West Strand, and, from end to end, the "long, lean, lanky

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

street" will have blossomed forth into a handsome wide avenue, the pride of the contractor, but where Dickens and even Mr. Henley would be as complete strangers as Pepys and Dr. Johnson.

I suppose it is as impossible to blame the County Council as it was to find fault with the Roman authorities a few years ago when they pulled down the old houses on the Tiber. The objection in both cases is purely sentimental. But sentiment counts for more and more in these matters, probably because every year now limits the chances for its exercise. I, for one, can look at that wall of scaffolding along the Strand with as little philosophy as at the glare of academical mosaics in the domes of Wren's cathedral or the restorer's neat façade at Peterborough. The work is passing all but unnoticed. A stray paragraph in a newspaper has commented upon it now and then, but London, busy about South Africa, has had no time to heed it. I have therefore come home from a walk through the dishonored street all the more eager to remind Americans that, if they would see the real Strand, they had best make what haste they can, for its days are numbered.

N. N.

Correspondence.

PORTO RICO OR PUERTO RICO?

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Can you inform a bewildered citizen of the official spelling of this word? The protracted controversy which has been carried on in the columns of various newspapers seems to leave the matter still undecided. We have been told that we must write "Puerto Rico," but no sooner have we become accustomed to the new spelling than we are told, by equally trustworthy authority, that the official spelling for the word is "Porto Rico." There has been, however, a varying usage in the different departments of our government. At present the wind seems to be blowing in the direction of "Porto Rico," which has been, I believe, the uniform usage of the *Nation*. I am prepared to abandon my old mumpsimus, but fear lest my new sumpsimus may itself soon prove to be an error.—Truly yours, F. L. P.

CHICOPEE, MASS., April 25, 1900.

[Congress has, in the new enabling act (so to call it), fixed the denomination as Porto Rico, and we think advisedly. It has long been the English name for the island, and it harmonizes with both the English adjective Porto Rican and the Spanish Portorriqueño. For the rest, it is far more important to do justice to the islanders than to gratify their sentiment for a vowel sound.—ED. NATION.]

HEROIC PEACE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: "In order to get rid of war we must make peace heroic," wrote John Hinton. "By not seeing the nature and significance of our common life it is sordid; and with that there exist heroic forms of activity [war, etc.], which are mischievous. How evidently these are two halves that need union; let the heroism be in the common life, and the mischievous forms of it will cease. The union here is in the common life being noble; which it must be when it is seen what it is, and what it allows scope for and demands."

To breed new ideals in a race, there is the rub. The heroisms of war are plainly seen and passionately applauded, our love for them seems instinctive, but can we not seriously teach the new thought about life? Can it be made plain to boys and girls that civilized society affords scope for just as noble and heroic action as the field of war? Some time, perhaps, we shall come to teach boys and girls who are learning the history of their country that it would have been a glory beyond any one nation had ever risen to, if we had given Spain half the cost of our late war to relinquish her claim to Cuba, and had spent the remaining half in healing the ravages of war, in succoring the naked and starving, caring for orphans, establishing schools, and cleansing cities. John Sherman declared that Spain was on the point of conceding. There seems little doubt that a quixotically generous offer would have been accepted. And why quixotic, when all the bloodshed, misery, bitterness, and inhumanity of war would have been avoided?

To speculate on the alternatives of history is not futile for beginners, for else they are apt to think the march of events has been inevitable and fatal. The dominance of the human will should be the fundamental principle of historical teaching. To every boy and girl should be made plain that individual human wills, characters, and passions determine events; that each boy himself shall be a maker of peace or war.

But would dollars told out across the sea redound to our credit as do crashing battleships? Would 3 per cent. loans, and stamps on cosmetics and pills, stand for enterprise, discipline, dash, bravery, and courage? No Hobson, no Sampson, no Dewey? Yes! if our youth could be made to believe in the strenuous self-denial, the splendid patience, the mutual reliance, the daring, the endurance, the honor that go to the making of a hundred million dollars in the field, in the factory, in the mine, on railroads and perilous seas; could see all the plain folk bending, sweating, bearing, braving the elements to share their loaf with Cuba; could see that dollars are not mere gold and silver coins bagged in bankers' vaults, to be hauled forth at the fiat of those in authority. Put the actualities of war, its trickeries, treacheries, and brutalities, along with its virtues, against the heroic endurance and skill manifested in common life, and mete out glory and honor to strenuous, downright manhood—who doubts where the laurels and medals and crosses would go?

Heroic activity makes instant appeal. To do away with war we have got to make the sacrifices of peace equally noble. Mothers, teachers, preachers, poets have got to sow new ideals. An appeal to the pocket, to prudence, thrift, and common sense will not do. Human nature is not made that way. Common life must be revealed as just as arduous and heroic as war, calling for just as great physical endurance, just as powerful mental and moral qualities; in truth, that to have achieved the results of the Spanish war by the methods of peace would have been just as much harder as it would have been nobler, and to the leaders who had attained such ends should fall laurels more enduring than those which greeted Sampson and Dewey.

SAMUEL M. ILSLEY.

SANTA BARBARA, CAL., April 20, 1900.

WHAT ARE THE BOERS FIGHTING FOR?

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In reading the last lines of that excellent article, "Some Historical Parallels," in your issue of April 19, "We can hardly accept Canon Wirgman's view, that 'The British Empire is waging a holy war for the cause of freedom and justice to the native races of South Africa,'" I began to suspect that you had not read the proclamation of President Steyn of the Orange Free State to the Afrikanders of Cape Colony, a part of which appeared in the *Independent* of last week. Here it is: "Do you wish, Afrikanders, to see this frightful abomination of a negro sitting with you in Parliament? It is what will happen to you, what will happen to us also, if you allow England to get the upper hand over us in this war." In that proclamation Steyn conjures up the spectre of equality with the negro race as his strongest argument for the war against England. This settles the question. The Boers are fighting for the maintenance of inequality among the native races of South Africa.

As this very important point has generally been overlooked by authors and newspapers, I shall beg leave to set it forth plainly before your readers, and to point out its direful and oppressive results for these unfortunate races. My main authority for the facts advanced is the February number of the Paris *Bibliothèque Universelle*.

Inequality of races is embodied into the Constitution of the Transvaal republic: "There cannot be equality between the white and the colored people, neither in the State nor in the Church." And this is the definition that the Constitution gives of the words "colored people": they are "those who have among their ancestors, unto the *fourth generation*, a man who did not belong to the white race." This inequality of race is still such a fundamental principle among the Boers that the Volksraad, the Transvaal Parliament, rejected a motion dispensing the native pastors and teachers from wearing the metal badge, which every black living in a city must wear, to show that he is employed by a white, in default of which he is sent to jail as a vagrant. The mover suggested that a written passport should take the place of this badge, but it was feared that such a concession would seem to establish the equality of a category of the blacks with the whites, and the motion was rejected. (Pretoria *Press*, weekly edition, August 29, 1898.)

What are the results of this constitutional inequality? The first is, that *the black man has no right before the law:* the magistrate may, at his will, accept or dismiss his complaint. Besides, an offence done to the prejudice of a black is less punished than the same offence if a white man is the victim of it. In a Volksraad sitting of June, 1899, in the course of a discussion of a law on the deprivation of civil rights, the Attorney-General gave to the Deputies the following explanation: "All sentences for murder are not infamous. A man will perhaps be sentenced to jail for

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

six months for having killed his black servant by dint of blows; it is quite evident that this will not deprive him of his rights as an elector."

Another result of the inequality is that *the black has no right to possess, nor even to rent*, the smallest portion of land in his own country. Some blacks are allowed by Boer farmers to cultivate a little piece of ground, but on condition that they shall perform all the base services (*corvées*) which may be required of them. All the natives who are unable to find a place on the Boer farms live in territories set apart for them, but from which they may be removed, at the Government's will and pleasure, after three months' notice.

A third result of the inequality is that *the black is liable to taxation and to statute labor, at will.* While the Boer who does not own a farm pays only two dollars tax, and the Boer farmer nine, the black, who may be only a day laborer, pays a tax of thirteen dollars. Last year the blacks were required to pay fifty dollars per head for the taxes of the current year and for those which they had not paid during the years of famine. The State commissioners, who receive from fifteen hundred to two thousand dollars salary a year, besides 5 per cent. of all the taxes and fines collected by them, manage to add a good deal to their income, and this is how: When a black cannot pay his tax, he is compelled to go and work at the mines. Recently 400 of these insolvent blacks entered Pretoria, guarded by police officers, who were taking them to Johannesburg. Now the companies which are short of hands pay a premium of five to ten dollars per head to the recruiter who brings them workmen. The Commissioners act as recruiters and pocket the premium. At the sitting of September 25, 1899, a member of the Volksraad declared that he knew a Commissioner who secured in this way a yearly income of $50,000. (Pretoria *Press*, weekly edition, of the same date.)

The three preceding results of inequality affect the black as an individual. Let us see how he is affected tribally. When a tribe, driven to despair, rebels, or refuses in a body to pay the taxes, an armed force pounces upon it, burns its villages, carries off its crops and herds, and the whole population is made captive, as a war booty, and divided between the men who took part in the expedition. These prisoners must serve for five years without wages. If they attempt to run away they may be shot down with impunity. This happened in 1894 in the southern part of Zoutspanberg, and in 1898 in the northern part of the same district.

Such is the legislation and such is the practice of the Boers to this very hour. It is feudality pure and simple. The farm-owners are the lords, the blacks the serfs bound to the soil, incapable of possessing any land, liable to taxation and to statute labor at will; the Commissioners represent the bailiffs who ground down those under their jurisdiction, in the name of the sovereign. Do not these few facts justify Canon Wirgman's view? And is it not evident that, in the case of this unfortunate man, your readers are called upon to choose not so much between Britons and Boers as between *freedom* and *oppression?*

L. C. ROUX.

SAXTON'S RIVER, VT.

THE ANTIQUITY OF CHESS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In my studies of the Talmud I have just come across some curious notices on the game of chess. The Talmud, more exactly called the "Babylonian Talmud," is a report compiled about the year 485 A. D. of the discussions which took place in the Jewish schools near the site of Babylon, from about 227 A. D. to the date of compilation, upon the Mishna—that is, on a collection of the Pharisaic Oral Law made in Palestine about 200 or 220 A. D. There is a question raised in the Mishna, Treatise Ketuboth (Marriage Contracts), on the right of a wife whose dowry comprises four slave women to be free from all household work and "to sit in a chair." The patriarch Simon, son of Gamaliel, objects that to do so would drive her into morbid listlessness—as ladies in those days lacked the resource of novel-reading, lawn-tennis, etc. Now when this passage comes up for discussion in the Talmud (Ketuboth, 61b), it is said she might play with little pups or at "nadrshir." This is evidently a corrupt reading for Ardeshir, the first King or Shah in the new Persian dynasty, under whose rule the Babylonian Jews lived, and the word indicates a game in which a "king" plays the foremost part. But Rashi, the great commentator on the Talmud, a rabbi living at Troyes in central France, who died in 1102, and whose comment on this subject we may place about the year 1090, leaves no doubt on the question. He says *ad locum*, "Nadrshir is what we call 'escaques,'" the Old-French form of "échecs," the German Schach=Shah.

Other lovers of the game, who read this communication, will please try to find equally authentic but older notices of chess.

Yours, etc., L. N. D.

LOUISVILLE, KY., April 23, 1900.

THE EPICENE PRONOUN.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Has attention been called to Shakspere's one use of *it* as an epicene pronoun? Neither Abbott nor Franz (in his recent 'Shakespeare-Grammatik') makes note of it. In "Midsummer-Night's Dream" ii, 1, 170-172, *Oberon* is made to say,

> "The juice of it on sleeping eyelids laid
> Will make or man or woman madly dote
> Upon the next live creature that *it* sees."

C. ALPHONSO SMITH.

BATON ROUGE, LA., April 25, 1900.

"SURE."

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: To what extent, if at all, is the word *sure* now employed adverbially in the United States? Both Miss Austen and Byron used it occasionally, though it appears to have been condemned as "vitious" by Johnson. Has our Irish apologetic or explanatory use of *sure* any hold upon you except as an Hibernianism? Has it any justification in older English, as have some of our supposed insularisms? Dr. Joyce suggests that, like some other of our "vulgarisms," it is an effort to supply in English a locution common in the Irish language.—Yours,

ALFRED WEBB.

DUBLIN, April 21, 1900.

Notes.

George W. Jacobs & Co., Philadelphia, expect to publish about May 20 a 'History of the University of Pennsylvania, from Its Foundation to A. D. 1700,' with biographical sketches of the trustees, faculty, first alumni, and others, by Thomas Harrison Montgomery. Only 750 copies of the book, an octavo of about 600 pages, printed from type, will be issued, to subscribers.

'The Cobra's Den,' a new volume of sketches of life and work among the Telugus of India, by the Rev. Jacob Chamberlain, M.D., D.D., will be published at once by Fleming H. Revell Co., in two large volumes with copious illustrations. Also, 'Arabia, the Cradle of Islam,' by the Rev. S. N. Zwemer, F.R.G.S.

A popular 'History of the Church of England,' by William Boyd Carpenter, Bishop of Ripon, is in the press of E. P. Dutton & Co.

Prof. Frank Moore Colby's 'International Year-Book,' or compendium of the world's progress, for 1899, is about to be issued by Dodd, Mead & Co.

Nearly ready is 'Studies in English Language and Grammar,' by Prof. George Lyman Kittredge of Harvard and Sarah Louise Arnold, Supervisor of Schools, Boston, which will bear the imprint of Ginn & Co. They have also in press 'Rome: Its Rise and Fall,' by Prof. P. V. N. Myers of the University of Cincinnati, an expansion of his text-book on Roman history.

Rand, McNally & Co., Chicago, have in press 'Uncle Sam Abroad,' University Extension lectures on the diplomatic and consular service of the United States, by J. E. Conner.

'Wuthering Heights' and vol. v. of the "Haworth Edition" of the Brontë sisters is now reached in the Harper issue. Mrs. Humphry Ward's estimate of Emily Brontë's genius is by no means slighting, as one might have gathered from English comments on it. She speaks of her early attainment of "mastery," as compared with Charlotte, and is not at all grudging in her recognition of the passion and poetry wrought into the romance of the proudest and most fiercely strong of will of the three sisters. The interesting announcement is made in this volume that the "Haworth Edition" is to conclude with a reissue of Mrs. Gaskell's 'Life of Charlotte Brontë,' edited by that Brontë expert Mr. Clement Shorter. His accumulation of material will there be fully and advantageously drawn upon.

There are not wanting great names to the sixty-second volume of Sidney Lee's 'Dictionary of National Biography' (Macmillan), which extends from Williamson to Worden, but mediocrity prevails. Still, one who grazes leisurely in it will meet with about the usual assortment of curious information not easily procurable elsewhere. Here, for example, is Field Marshal Viscount Wolseley's Cromwellian ancestor, Sir Charles. And in another sphere of human interest, there died in 1855 Charles Windeyer, "first recognized reporter in the House of Lords," who was pursuing his calling surreptitiously when Lord Eldon's robe caught his notebook, audaciously resting on their lordships' bar. Eldon was a stickler for non-reporting, but he courteously picked up the leaves fallen within the bar and returned them, and that was

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the end of a prohibition already relinquished by the Commons. Personages having a cisatlantic relation are relatively numerous —Governor Winslow of Plymouth Colony, the elder and the younger Winthrop, General Wolfe, John Woolman, the ornithologist Wilson.

The 'Battle of Tippecanoe,' by Capt. Alfred Pirtle, is the latest publication of the Filson Club of Louisville, Kentucky, which has now published fifteen works by its members, all pertaining to the early history of Kentucky and the Ohio valley, beginning with a memoir of John Filson, the first historian of Kentucky, from whom the club was named. In this volume of 158 pages Capt. Pirtle has made a careful review of the circumstances leading to the expedition of Gov. Harrison against the Indians under Tecumseh's brother, the Prophet, as well as of the expedition itself and the battle. Three fine photographs of the battlefield (now preserved as a park by the State of Indiana) are well reproduced in half-tone, full page, and make a panorama of the field as it now appears. The Club's publications are all large-paper quartos, printed in old-style pica on antique laid paper, and the typography would do credit to any press. The works are serious studies, by competent men, of topics of real historical value. John P. Morton & Co. of Louisville are the printers to the Club.

It can hardly be expected that treatises on the examination of the eyes should interest the general public, except as indicating the degree to which science and accurate work have brought forward this branch of medical practice. Dr. A. Edward Davis's text-book on 'The Refraction of the Eye' (Macmillan) has, to quote from the author's preface, been written "to the end of demonstrating the clinical and practical use of the ophthalmometer, and of recording the advances made in the science and practice of the Refraction of the Eye." It is intended especially for the beginner, and we should commend it without qualification were it not for its positive statements with regard to the "utter uselessness of a myopiatic in fitting glasses in the vast majority of cases, even in young subjects." Admirable as the book is in other respects, this is, we think, a serious objection, and marks a step backward and not forward.

Dr. W. P. Letchworth's 'Care and Treatment of Epileptics' (Putnams) deals in a practical form with a subject which should lie near the heart of every citizen, namely, the duty of the pubic with regard to the care of epileptics, and the manner in which these duties should be performed. Authoritative opinions as to the responsibilities of the state in this matter find expression from many quarters. Among others, Prof. Binzwanger, the well-known author of the recent voluminous and painstaking treatise on epilepsy, published in Germany, declares that the institution, in some form, is the place for all epileptics who do not show themselves readily amenable to medical treatment. Most thoughtful physicians, even if they do not go so far as Dr. McKim, the writer of the recent work on 'Heredity and Human Progress,' demand that the state should protect the community against the degenerate as well as against the criminal, so far as this protection can be accomplished by legislation. On this ground, as well as for the sake of the sufferer himself, the amplest means should be afforded for happiness and useful activity apart from those with whom he cannot associate on equal terms. The taxpayer should not shrink from the cost of this separate maintenance, but, fortunately, it has been demonstrated that the epileptics, like the feeble-minded, under skilful leadership, can earn a good deal for themselves and gain thereby in health and independence. Dr. Letchworth studies with care, and on a basis of ample knowledge, what has been done in general and in detail in this direction, both in this country and abroad, and points out what may yet be done, drawing a picture wherein the wretchedness of many epileptics outside of the institution, and their relative and even absolute happiness within it, are contrasted in a way to appeal strongly to the wealthy, the generous, and the public-spirited.

We read in the *Library Journal* for April an obituary sketch of William Kite, for more than thirty years librarian of the Friends' Library in Germantown, Pa., who died on February 10, in his ninetieth year. "His special hobby was to build up a library *without fiction*," and, being seconded by the managers of the above institution, he excluded not only novels but periodicals like *Harper's*, the *Century*, the *Atlantic*, because of their fiction department. It is added that he himself never read a novel in his life.

Among the miscellaneous contents of the Consular Reports for April is a note on the railroad construction in Asia Minor, with a useful map of the railways in operation, the recent German concessions, and other proposed lines. Of these the most promising appears to be that from Samsun on the southern shore of the Black Sea through Sivas to Bagdad, which would open up a country vastly superior in agricultural products to that through which the German line is to run. Our Consul-General to Siam reports a great amount of building in Bangkok at the present time, which, if it continues, will transform the place from a vast collection of thatched bamboo huts to a city in large part made up of brick, iron, and tile. Our Minister to China writes that, upon a petition of the Society for the Protection of Game in China, the Tsungli Yamen has prohibited the exportation of pheasant skins, in order to prevent the extermination of the bird, for whose plumage a great demand has recently sprung up in Europe.

The Quarterly Statement of the Palestine Exploration Fund for April contains a minute account of the life of the country woman in Palestine, which is especially interesting for the numerous facts adduced to show that the Canaanite of the time of Abraham and Ruth has been "transformed with very slight changes into the modern Fellah." Her duties in both the house and the field give her greater freedom and self-reliance than the townswoman possesses, and she "certainly is esteemed by her husband a good deal more than is her sister in town." In a sketch of the history of modern colonization in Palestine, mention is made of the reclaiming of unhealthy districts by the planting of immense eucalyptus groves; in one place there are three-quarters of a million trees. Besides the usual reports of excavations, there are short articles on the vocal music of the fellahin and the dimensions of the coffer of the Great Pyramid, with notes on inscriptions.

Dr. Edgar James Banks, director of the proposed excavation of the ruin round Mugheir, or Ur of the Chaldees, in Babylonia, issues from 10 Appian Way, Cambridge, Mass., the plan, which may also conveniently embrace the excavation of the neighboring Nowawis, ancient Eridu. The chances of a rich return are excellent, according to the best authority. Whatever Abraham's birthplace yields will be deposited with the Smithsonian Institution at Washington, and permission to dig will be asked for by the director (late U. S. Consul at Bagdad) as soon as $5,000 of the desired $50,000 is pledged.

Rural education, or instruction which shall give children an intelligent knowledge of the common things that surround them in the country, is recommended in a circular sent by the Board of Education to the teachers of elementary schools situated in the agricultural districts of England and Wales. Practical agriculture is not to be taught, but children should be trained to recognize plants and insects useful or injurious to the farmer, and to handle the simpler tools used in garden and farm work in the cultivation of a school garden. There should be given "lessons on the spot about animals in the fields and farmyards, about ploughing and sowing, about fruit trees and forest trees, about birds, insects, and flowers, and other objects of interest." School excursions under the guidance of teachers to places in the neighborhood are recommended for the purpose of awakening and quickening the observing faculties. "This sort of teaching will, it is hoped, directly tend to foster in the children a genuine love for the country and for country pursuits."

The death is announced of the Danish sculptor Georg Christian Freund, born in Altona, February 5, 1821. In 1836 he went to Copenhagen, where he studied under his uncle, the famous Herman Freund, whom he did not follow in treating Old Norse subjects, but won his chief success in modelling children and women, especially young mothers. His name is closely connected with Thorvaldsen's by his work on the decorations of the Thorvaldsen Museum, and by his reproductions in marble of many of the older master's works. He also restored his uncle's great frieze Ragnarok, in the original production of which he had assisted. This last unselfish effort, which consumed five years, is sometimes attributed to the Norwegian sculptor Stefan Sinding.

—The third volume of the publications of the Colonial Society of Massachusetts makes a handsome book of 576 pages, and covers the transactions for 1895-'97. Though somewhat belated, it brings a rich store of material. While the subjects of the papers are for the most part local, they have been treated by experts with a breadth of view that gives them a general readability. The two papers by Andrew McF. Davis are of this class, for his account of the Provincial Banks contains the record of an experience in paper money and interested banking which may serve as a warning to all efforts to manipulate the value of currency by legislation; and his examination of the case of Frost vs. Leighton shows that the decision of Marshall in Marbury vs. Madison was foreshadowed in the experience of colonial Massachusetts; for the Superior Court of Judicature of the Province twice refused

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to carry out a royal order issued by the King in Privy Council, giving as a reason that the charter of the province did not confer upon them powers which would enable them to obey the order. Of equal interest are the careful studies by John Noble on the "Trial and Punishment of Crimes," in the early years of the colony; on the "Court Files of Suffolk," and on the "Libel Suit of Knowles vs. Douglass." The curious proceedings of the college authorities involving the adventures of a turkey and some students should not be neglected, for they illustrate the social life of the time (1685).

—A mere list of the papers will not give an idea of the variety of contents. The essay by Prof. Goodale on "Early New England Plants" is of scientific value, and that by Robert Toppan on the "Failure to Establish an Hereditary Political Aristocracy in the Colonies" is a social study by one steeped in colonial history. It contains scant mention of Virginia, where the aristocratic feeling was fostered by the existence of slavery and by the purchase of the higher offices. Albert Matthews exhibits the use of the word "campus," and some letters from a Loyalist to his wife touch upon Boston when it was passing from the colonial stage, and not very peacefully. Henry Edes contributes a long letter from Henry Dunster on the early history of Harvard College. This very important document is reproduced in facsimile, and the folds, stains, and even the wire-marks of the paper are evident. An index of more than eighty pages is a model of its kind, evidencing excessive care in determining names and dates, and much enhancing the value of the book. When the year-books of the patriotic societies are compared with such issues as this volume of the Colonial Society, the wonder grows that more is not done in making available the large mass of floating manuscript material to be found in every State.

—Some books inevitably suggest comparison with others, and Mr. Quiller-Couch's 'Historical Tales from Shakespeare' (Scribners) is one of these. Who can hear the title, 'Tales from Shakespeare,' without thinking of Charles and Mary Lamb? Lest it be thought that a living writer is trying to crowd out an old favorite—indeed, a classic—we hasten to say that Mr. Quiller-Couch has written the present volume with no irreverent thought. He simply begins where the Lambs left off, and casts into prose the plays which they discard as being unconnected with their immediate purpose. His aim, too, is more didactic than theirs. While they sought merely to please, he wishes to instruct and to arouse enthusiasm. He would persuade his young audience "that history (in spite of their natural distrust) is by no means a dull business when handled by one who marvellously understood the human heart, and was able to put life into the figures of men and women long passed away." "What of Shakspere's historical trustworthiness?" it may be asked. Mr. Quiller-Couch touches upon this subject, too, and commits himself to the opinion that "nowhere, in spite of many inaccuracies, can historical pictures be found so vivid and in the main so just as in these historical plays of Shakspere." Occasionally he admits, as in the case of Joan of Arc, that a glaring injustice has been done by the poet, but grave misconceptions of this sort are set right in the narrative. The book contains "Coriolanus" and "Julius Caesar," besides the English historical plays from "King John" to "Richard the Third." Throughout, the necessary historical explanations are brought into the text, and at one point the aid of a genealogical tree is not disdained. Mr. Quiller-Couch has been very successful in turning dramatic dialogue into conversation which is vigorous without being undignified. Unlike the Lambs, he uses words which form no part of Shakspere's vocabulary, but he is not flippantly "up to date." The least satisfactory part of the version is the paraphrasing of set speeches or monologues, like the harangue of Antony over Caesar's body, the outburst of Henry V.—"Who's he that wishes so"—and Clarence's dream. Here the task is too much for even an essayist of Mr. Quiller-Couch's attainments. At one or two places, however, snatches of Shakspere are given; *e. g.*, the patriotic passages, "This England never did, nor never shall," and "This royal throne of kings, this scepter'd isle." The conception of the book is good, and Mr. Quiller-Couch has carried it out in an extremely clever, spirited manner.

—Parts xxiv. and xxv. of Poole's Historical Atlas (Henry Frowde), bring that great work within measurable distance of completion. Part xxiv. comprises three maps, of widely varying subject. Of these the most important contribution is that of Europe 1863-1897, by Prof. Prothero, which shows the various changes of boundaries, and is accompanied by a considerable sketch of the period that would make, perhaps, a dozen 12mo pages. Mr. R. S. Rait's two maps of Scotland—the one showing the Parliamentary representation down to 1832, and the other the principal clans and families—are very interesting; in particular the second, which is further enhanced by the insertion of the principal battlefields of modern Scotch history. Mr. T. A. Archer contributes to this number a map of Syria during the period of the Crusades, 1096-1291, with an inset of the kingdom of Cyprus. Part xxv. includes the Rev. J. P. Whitney's Germany at the Peace of Westphalia, 1648, with a useful inset showing the Circles. Mr. H. A. L. Fisher continues his Revolutionary and Napoleonic series with a map of the French Empire in 1810, with its 130 departments marked on the map and listed, with the corresponding provincial and territorial names of the old régime, in the letterpress. He seems to have omitted Golo and Liamone in lettering the map, and the island of Capraja altogether. Mr. H. E. Egerton continues his series of maps of the western hemisphere with a plate containing two large and two small maps: the United States after the Treaty of Paris, 1783; the French Proposals of 1782, according to Jay; the two lines of frontier agreed to, in October and November, 1872, respectively, by Mr. Oswald—the first line after the map in Fitzmaurice's Life of Shelburne, the second after Mitchell's map in the British Museum, "but without reproducing its geographical errors"; and, finally, an inset showing the boundary established by the Treaty of Washington of 1842. In general, these maps are rather more satisfactory than their predecessors in the series, though Mr. Egerton has compensated for the omission of the errors of Mitchell's map by the insertion of certain errors of his own. According to his map Kentucky was admitted to the Union in 1872, instead of 1792, as correctly given in the accompanying letterpress. West Virginia, again, would seem by the map alone to have been one of the thirteen original States. The battle of Trenton was fought December 26, not, as appears here, December 25—an error which seems slight in itself, but was really one of the decisive circumstances of the affair. It was William I., King of the Netherlands, not Leopold I., King of the Belgians, who arbitrated the Northeast Boundary question, and this was done not in 1831, but in 1827. Both of these mistakes occur in the preface. And finally, not to multiply details, it would have been far better, historically, to have indicated the claims of the thirteen States on the territory outside their borders than to sketch in the States created out of that territory later, as is done here.

—The great Thomas a'Kempis, besides having his golden book "reprinted more than ten thousand times in all the languages of the world," has now, in his honor, a superb marble monument erected in the Church of St. Michael at Zwolle, Over-Ijssel, Netherlands. As late as 1895, foreign visitors inquiring for the shrine of the great Thomas, and naturally expecting it to be magnificent, were very apt to be met with a smile, and to be waved aside, with reference to a certain box of bones and the broken bits of gravestones. A neat pamphlet of twelve pages, giving the whole history of the Agnietenberg, or the graveyard in which stood the cloister where Thomas a'Kempis spent most of his life, with an account of the erection and dedication of the monument, proofs of the authenticity of a'Kempis's authorship, and a large photograph showing the art work, is in our hands. The commission formed in 1890, and the jury of award, composed of eminent men in the Netherlands, agreed upon a marble tomb-monument of old Netherlandish and Flemish architecture of the fifteenth century, of polychrome marble as to the base, which contains inscriptions in gold, and of pure white marble in the parts which contain the figures and decorative work of arches and ornate finials. Within the sarcophagus are contained the bones of the good monk, which were removed in 1672, together with the two gray stones which had enclosed them at head and foot. On the base or platform of the monument are inscribed "Honori non memoriae Thomae Kempensis cujus nomen perennius quam monumentum," and the text from the Vulgate, "Qui sequitur me non ambulat in tenebris." The list of the subscribers shows a wide range of royal, noble, learned, artistic, and general lovers of art, of history, and of this, one of the most famous of the brethren of the common life. Concerning proofs of the authorship of 'Het Boekje der Navolging van Christus,' the writer of the monograph recalls the fact that, among the manuscripts of the Royal Library of Brussels, there are, in one bundle, the first of the four books of the 'Imitation of Christ' and nine other manuscripts, all in the same handwriting, and enclosed with the words, "Finished and completed by the hands of Brother Thomas a'Kempis in the year 1441"; the last tract in the bundle having been finished in that year. In 1879 a reproduction in facsimile of the autograph manuscript of 1441 was published, with an introduction in French by Charles Ruelans, the 'Imitation' having been written in 1420 in the cloister of Agnietenberg. The work on the monument was done by F. W. Mengelberg of Utrecht.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BANCROFT'S SEWARD.—II.

The Life of William H. Seward. By Frederic Bancroft. With portraits. In two volumes. Harper & Bros. Post 8vo, pp. 553, 576.

The extent to which the personal love of power and desire of eminence enters into the motives of public men may be debated endlessly. Mr. C. F. Adams, in the just published life of his father, says with honest frankness that the Appeal from the New to the Old Whigs, published in 1835, "secured for Mr. Adams what he then deeply hungered for—a degree of personal recognition." A state in which its able men have no hunger for personal recognition, is in deadly peril. A cynical epicurism would seem to be all that is left to it. In the group of acknowledged leaders of the political anti-slavery movement preceding the civil war, no one was wholly devoid of self-love, or, even, perhaps, of vanity in regard to his relative importance. Mr. Seward's character did not compare unfavorably with that of others. His genial sociability might more freely reveal what more reticent men would hide; but his generosity, his placability, and his good faith, gave him a personal character not inferior to the rest.

Parliamentary struggles have their tactics and their stratagems akin to those of war. In each there is a conventional standard of what is fair and unfair. As a leader, it fell to Seward to direct many a contest in which advantages of position were sought or crafty plans of his opponents were to be brought to naught. He acquired a reputation for skill which defeated opponents were pretty sure to call trickiness. This is illustrated by the debate on President Pierce's message concerning the Clayton-Bulwer treaty in 1855. Looking, as Mr. Bancroft says, for an issue that might unite his party and call attention away from the Kansas troubles, Pierce asserted that Great Britain had organized a new colony in Central America contrary to the treaty, and the Democracy was ready to threaten war. Although Mr. Seward had in 1853 opposed a similar agitation started by Cass and Soulé, he now accepted the Democratic contention that a new aggressive movement had been made by England, and advised that notice of intervention be given, to be followed by actual intervention within a year if the assumed new dominion were not discontinued. This "stealing their thunder" disconcerted the Democracy, and the matter was dropped. Mr. Seward's belligerency was no more heard of, either. Mr. Bancroft says of it that, "by pretending to be more bent on war than the President, Seward destroyed the anticipated monopoly." But he goes further, descanting severely on the inconsistency, and suggests gratuitously another motive than that which Seward avowed, which was "to keep some of our Republican friends from falling, or rather jumping, into the pit that the President had dug for us so skilfully." This new motive is supposed to be Seward's desire to promote his nomination for the Presidency by pleasing Republicans of Democratic and Know-Nothing antecedents (i, p. 488). Mr. Bancroft says further, that

"Sumner jocosely characterized the performance as helping the Democracy play Alcibiades's trick of cutting off a dog's tail so as to give the people of Athens something to talk about; and he added that Seward had furnished 'a new argument to those who say that he leaps upon every hobby without regard to principle'" (i, p. 489).

As Mr. Bancroft had charged Seward with garbling a paragraph in the treaty, this use of Sumner's authority is somewhat astonishing. The reference is to E. L. Pierce's Sumner, and, on turning to it, we find that, within five days after Seward's speech, Mr. Sumner, writing to C. F. Adams on February 5, said of it, "Seward's speech is said to have killed all idea of war; by invoking war, he has made it impossible for this Administration to press it. I have been on the point of speaking on the question fully, but I cannot now regard it as a reality." This Mr. Bancroft omits. A month later, writing to John Jay, Sumner says of the war issues which Seward had killed, and on which he had thought of speaking fully, "Never at any moment have they seemed to me to have any vitality. I have thought it a mistake on the part of Seward to take part in them, and thus help magnify them, or at least draw to them public attention, which is precisely what the Administration desires." Sumner evidently had forgotten that he had written to Adams a month before that it was Seward's speech that had taken the vitality out of them, which could hardly be what the Administration desired. It was here that he added: "There is no honesty in the way in which these questions have been pressed," *i. e.*, by the Administration, and he now calls it "the old trick of Alcibiades." When Mr. Bancroft says that Sumner "*added* that Seward had furnished a new argument" to his detractors, he is making an excerpt from another letter—to Mr. Adams, not to Mr. Jay; nor at that time, but a fortnight before. To speak of the mosaic thus constructed as Sumner's characterization of Seward's "performance," is a singular use of historical material, and the more so because, if the whole of Sumner's opinion were wanted, the next page of Pierce's book furnishes another letter to Mr. Adams, dated March 29, when, under Seward's leadership, the war issue had been buried and the great debate recalled to the Kansas question, promising "a true fusion with a real chance of success." In this Sumner also said, "Seward will make the greatest speech of his life; he is showing new power daily. I heard one of his speeches in caucus and was electrified by it; it was powerful in its eloquence."

The winter following Lincoln's election was a critical time in Seward's career, as it was in the history of the country. He had swallowed his own disappointment, making no public sign, and had given Mr. Lincoln the support of an advocacy which, for freshness of view and persuasiveness of appeal, equalled any efforts of brain and heart he had ever made. But when the campaign was won and Congress assembled, actual secession of States and the helplessness of the President were the terrible facts staring us in the face. The awful problem had two parts, How to bridge the chasm of ninety days till the new Administration should assume power? and What policy should it adopt when the responsibility should be assumed? Bridging the chasm was no trifling task. They were not the least intelligent and able among Republicans who reckoned imminent the danger that before March the capital would be in the hands of the insurgents, with all the archives and the material organization of the government. At an early day of the session, Seward was aware that he was to be Lincoln's Secretary of State, and he remained the sole member of the prospective cabinet till the winter was nearly over. He saw that the true policy for the nonce was to have no policy, but to preserve a peaceful status, and to cultivate love of the Union wherever, North or South, that sentiment could be invigorated. The hope that a sober second thought in the South would repudiate secession was the one possibility of peace. Persistency of secession meant war. The decision of Buchanan to have the peace last his time, and to hand over the government to his successor at the Capitol, was encouraged because it helped bridge the interval. When Black and Stanton and Dix entered Buchanan's Cabinet, Seward cultivated relations with them and earnestly cooperated with and encouraged their loyal purposes. He favored Congressional committees to consider the means of avoiding the strife. He did not oppose the Peace Conference called by Virginia. He applauded every expression, in whatever form, of the desire to preserve Union and peace. He worked assiduously to engage leading men in the border States to advocate peace and Union. His speech of January 12, which Mr. Bancroft calls "as wise, as patriotic, and as important a speech as has ever been delivered within the walls of the Capitol" (ii, 16), was the eloquent presentation of these sentiments and of his own readiness to go to the verge in meeting "prejudice with conciliation, exaction with concession which surrenders no principle, and violence with the right hand of peace." The basis of peace which he suggested was the same which he had received from Mr. Lincoln and had presented in the Senate Committee of Thirteen. It was wholly consistent with the principles on which the Republicans had fought the campaign, except that in the arid territory between Mexico and Kansas a contingent concession to Douglas's followers in the North (nearly as numerous as Lincoln's) was offered, subject to the action of a constitutional convention to be called after secession and disunion should be given up. Underlying this was a more or less explicit faith in Webster's "law of nature" which would prevent slavery from taking root there.

It would be hard to improve the first current statement Mr. Bancroft makes of Seward's conduct and words in this trying time; but when this is done, there comes the inevitable special pleading to show possible lower motives, and to conclude that therefore Seward acted from them. Again Mr. Weed is brought on the stage, and we are told that as Mr. Seward must have had certain definite aims, "it will be less difficult to indicate what they were after we know whether he and Weed were substantially of one mind" (ii, 26). True, Weed had said that he spoke only for himself, and Seward had, on December 4, repudiated responsibility for Mr. Weed's "well-intentioned but rather impulsive movement"; but Mr. Bancroft falls back on the argument that, "so far as is known, he never directly affirmed that he was opposed to Weed's opinions." What matters it that Seward had said (and Mr. Bancroft quotes it) that "when he desires to be heard, he is in the habit of speaking in his proper place for himself"? Mr. Bancroft replies that "this is not considered final," for "Seward was determined to conceal his opinions." If we were to say, Let us agree, then, that we don't know them, and look to his acts, our author replies, No, we must look to Weed's opinions. And this is

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

after we have had full comment on Seward's January speech, and his correspondence with Lincoln as well as with others is before us! But what *were* Weed's opinions and of what date? Mr. Weed edited a daily paper and expressed various opinions in the course of that winter. Mr. Bancroft gives us very little help, and we feel far less sure that we know, after reading these pages, what Mr. Weed thought than that we understand Mr. Seward. Indeed, there is almost no effort at all to state definitely or to analyze Mr. Weed's views, much less to show that they were continuous through the winter, progressive or otherwise. The end seems to have been reached with the conclusion that Seward agreed with Weed, whatever the latter believed, and therefore Seward is discredited. This would not be worth the space given it if the culmination of the curious method were not found in dealing with Mr. Seward in the first weeks of the new Administration, before his supposed conversion by the bombardment of Fort Sumter.

Taking Seward's public speeches and his correspondence as our guide, his position on the 4th of March was this: He hoped the secession rage would pass away if a carefully pacific policy were pursued. Such a policy would consolidate the North. It would possibly keep the border States from seceding. His conclusion was, cultivate Union sentiments, and, if war must come, let the secessionists be plainly the aggressors in the military conflict. Before Judge Holt left the War Department, he informed the new President that Anderson reported that he was getting short of provisions, while he and Scott believed that a large land and naval force would be necessary to relieve the fort. After some days of inquiry and study of the situation and several cabinet meetings, Lincoln, on March 15, asked the written opinions of his cabinet on the subject. All but two thought it necessary to evacuate the fort, and, of the two, one (Chase) said he would not favor the attempt to hold it if it involved the "enlistment of armies and the expenditure of millions." Seward's opinion repeated the doctrines we have stated as his. As to the fort he said: "If it were possible to peacefully provision Fort Sumter, of course I should answer that it would be both unwise and inhuman not to attempt it." As to the border States, he said their disposition at the moment was to adhere to the Union unless some popular exasperation should be aroused. Our aggressive military operation would do this. Yet the Administration must maintain the Union, "peacefully if it can, forcibly if it must—to every extremity." He would put the odium of a military conflict on the seceders, accepting war when it comes. He would persevere in this policy "for a short time longer." He would assemble the navy on the coast, collect the revenues on the water, and "defer military action on land until a case should arise where we would hold the defensive."

Besides Fort Sumter, we held three forts in the Gulf, all in Florida. The seceders had occupied all others. The three were Fort Taylor at Key West, Fort Jefferson at Tortugas, and Fort Pickens in front of Pensacola. The two first named were separated from the mainland by the broad Florida Channel, and Pickens was on Santa Rosa Island, where it could be reinforced without necessary conflict with the Confederate forces. After the change in his cabinet, Buchanan had ordered all three to be reinforced and provisioned. The garrison for Pickens on March 4 was on the U. S. S. *Brooklyn*, off the fort, kept from landing by a "quasi-truce" between Buchanan and the rebel authorities. Meanwhile Lieut. Slemmer, with a handful of men, held the fort. On the 11th of March the new Administration ordered the landing to be made, and, although there was an annoying hitch in obeying, the reinforcement was in fact made under that order. It was made without hostile interference, and the fort was securely held throughout the war.

With these facts firmly in mind, we are prepared to estimate Mr. Bancroft's attack upon Mr. Seward's good faith in dealing with the rebel Commissioners who were in Washington. For brevity's sake we may pass by the efforts of these Commissioners to obtain an audience with the Secretary of State, which was refused, and come to March 15, when Mr. Campbell of Alabama, later the Confederate Assistant Secretary of War, appears as an intermediary. Mr. Bancroft enjoys the wit of Lincoln's designation of professed loyal men in the South as "white crows," but he omits to tell us that Mr. Campbell was a bird of that feather. He refers to him in this matter as Justice Campbell of the Supreme Court, as he then was, and as Lee and Johnston were then officers of the United States Army. The fact and the omission are important, as Mr. Bancroft's attack upon Seward's good faith is chiefly based on recollections Mr. Campbell put in print a dozen years later. On the same 15th of March Mr. Seward wrote and put on the department records a memorandum of his refusal to have diplomatic intercourse with the Commissioners or to recognize them. Keeping within strict diplomatic usage, he did not even communicate this to them by note, but caused them to be informed that they could get a copy by calling for it at the department. The same date was that of his written opinion about Sumter, called for by the President. The same day he wrote home calling the question about "Davis's ambassadors" "cabinet work" and therefore secret, and saying, "My duties call me to the White House one, two or three times a day." So constantly and closely was he conferring with the President.

After an interview with Mr. Seward, Judge Campbell made a statement to the Commissioners, which he reported to Seward as being that he "had entire confidence that Fort Sumter would be evacuated in five days, and that no measure changing the existing status of things prejudicially to the Confederate States is at present contemplated by the Administration." Reasons why the Commissioners should not press, for an answer to themselves were added, and Campbell concluded by saying that he cautioned them "not to speak of our intercourse, and not to express any surmise as to the source from which my assurances were derived. I [Campbell] did not mention any name to them." The original note Campbell handed the Commissioners is still more guardedly in his own name in every clause.

The importance of the details of form cannot be overlooked by anybody at all acquainted with diplomatic history. Lest even an informal conversation with the Commissioners should be claimed to be some recognition of the Confederacy or of the official character of the men themselves, Mr. Seward refused to see them or acknowledge their communication in writing. In permitting Judge Campbell to state his own belief, he was forbidden to state the grounds of it or whence he had got it. They must act on the fact that he believed what he said, or not act at all. Seward did not ask any promises or pledges, because that would also be an agreement between parties of whom he must be one—precisely what he refused to be. Campbell wrote to Jefferson Davis himself, on April 3: "I have no right to mention any name or to pledge any person." Those he communicated with had no right to know how he obtained his information. They might assume, if they liked, that he was hid in a closet and overheard Lincoln and Seward talk, or that he had a confederate who stole copies of letters, *à la bordereau*. In short, Mr. Seward had taken the most thorough means known to diplomacy to convey to an enemy a fact which he thought would have an effect favorable to his own cause, without leaving the possibility of any claim of pledge, or even of communication, on his part. He took the risk of the Commissioners' freedom from pledge enabling them to do what, in fact, they did—advise their Government to send at once a force large enough to capture Fort Pickens. In the face of all this, Mr. Bancroft champions the Confederate contention that Mr. Seward violated pledges made between March 15 and April 3, when Campbell told the President of the Confederacy himself that there were none, and that he had been authorized to make none!

But how about the *fact* which Mr. Seward allowed Campbell to communicate? Treat it as we should a similar case between Mr. McKinley and Mr. Hay to-day. The presumption is that the Secretary expressed the purpose of his chief, by his authority. Whoever controverts this must establish it by positive preponderant evidence. It was Lincoln through Seward who spoke, allowing his purpose of withdrawing Anderson from Sumter to be known. The withdrawal could only be by Lincoln's act. It would be worse than puerile, it would be idiotic, to say the thing would be done before a letter could reach Montgomery, unless that was the President's existing intention. Couple with this the fact that Seward would not settle the question of a personal interview with the Commissioners till he submitted it to Lincoln. Can we believe the mere form was matter for consultation and not the substance? Add that Seward was going to Lincoln several times a day; add his established habit of careful cooperation shown in every step since December, and doubts vanish. To suppose Mr. Lincoln during March "had halted between two opinions and had acted on none," as Mr. Bancroft does (ii, p. 134), is more derogatory to him than any other hypothesis, besides contradicting the contemporaneous evidence. He intended to withdraw the garrison and to preserve the peace for the time, by letting it be known; but he and his Secretary had so guarded the revelation of that purpose as absolutely to retain his right to change it at any moment, without asking anybody's leave or giving anybody notice. To say that they were bound to give such notice to the Commissioners is ridiculous; but unless giving it to Campbell was for the purpose of passing it on to the Commissioners, what is the pother about?

Lamon's errand to Charleston was Mr.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Lincoln's own, and gave an opportunity for one of those bits of amateur diplomacy outside the State Department which naturally annoyed Mr. Seward. Gen. Crawford, who was in Fort Sumter, says the garrison, from Anderson down, understood from Lamon that they were to be withdrawn. But Lamon was tempted to negotiate with Gov. Pickens about the kind of ship which should be sent, and the fat was in the fire. He was not authorized to touch this subject, and now for the first time in the whole transaction an acknowledged agent of the President made representations which might involve an obligation. Lincoln repudiated his authority to have any communication with Confederates on the subject of withdrawing the garrison, but we find no denial on his part that such had in fact been his intention. He solved the difficulty with scrupulous honor by saying he would give Gov. Pickens notice if he should decide to attempt throwing in relief to the fort.

Capt. Fox's plan for sending in a ship at night seemed worth trying; the general agitation of public opinion seemed to run in the direction of an effort to relieve Anderson; Lincoln determined to try it, as he had a right to do. Seward was vexed, and his vexation came to the surface in his now famous "Thoughts for the President's Consideration"; but he at once settled to his work again, and the President and he were like hand and glove till assassination struck at them both at once. The rebels made the question of prolonging the peace policy a mere academic one. Their attack on Sumter was the military aggression for which Seward had counselled waiting. It united the North as he had predicted. Douglas and his million backers supported gigantic warlike armaments to uphold the Union. The Republican party gave way to the Union party, and the old name was not revived till the war was over. Seward's practical mind dropped the debate whether a postponement of the collision would have resulted in reunion, for the juncture had now come in which he had said he would maintain the Union by force "to every extremity." There is evidence that Davis yielded to the hotheads' exhortation to precipitate the conflict and prevent a reaction, and we know that Toombs, his Secretary of State, said of it, "It is suicide, murder, and will lose us every friend at the North."

PRACTICAL ÆSTHETICS.

Proportion and Harmony of Line and Color in Painting, Sculpture, and Architecture. An Essay in Comparative Æsthetics. By George Lansing Raymond, L.H.D., Professor of Æsthetics in Princeton University. Author of 'Art in Theory,' 'The Representative Significance of Form,' 'Poetry as a Representative Art,' 'Painting, Sculpture, and Architecture as Representative Arts,' 'The Genesis of Art Form,' 'Rhythm and Harmony in Poetry and Music,' etc. G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1899.

It is in this imposing manner, with the prestige of a professorship in an important university as well as that of a doctorate and of a long list of previous works, that Prof. Raymond introduces the seventh volume of his amazing series of works on Æsthetics. It has been a common scoff at critics that they aspire to instruct the masters in their own art, and to tell them how their work should have been produced; and the answer of the critic, if he were possessed of any modesty or humor, has been that he sought to teach not the artist, but the public—that his aim was the elucidation of the good or the bad in existent work, not the formulation of rules by which good work might be produced or even bad work avoided. Either a congenital lack of humor or the acquired habit of pedagogy has prevented Prof. Raymond from taking this view, and he boldly proclaims his intention of helping art and the artist. His aim is "practical," he says. He refers constantly to the necessity of a sound theory as a basis for good production, and is so sure that he has supplied this theory that, while he hardly expects "artists and critics and patrons of art" to recognize him "as one who, in all that he has written, has been mainly anxious to be helpful to them"; yet, "whatever they may think, he is certain that he will prove helpful in reality, in case" they pay any attention to his teaching.

Albert Dürer said: "Whosoever taketh council in the arts, let him take it from one thoroughly versed in those matters, who can prove what he saith *with his hand*." This is strong doctrine, and the test too severe, perhaps, to be enforced. A professor of æsthetics deals, necessarily, with many arts, and to ask him to prove his competence in any one of them by the actual creation of a work of art would be to ask the manifestly impossible; for he who can practise any art has other things to do than to profess æthetics. But we may at least demand of him who writes of art some fair degree of information, and may refuse to listen to the theories of one whose surprising ignorance glares from every page. Even the teaching of college youth requires some knowledge, and here we have the avowed purpose to teach the teachers and to be schoolmaster to the masters; and this avowal is made by a man who blunders wherever blundering is possible, and often where it might be thought impossible. That this characterization is justified, we shall proceed to show by a few citations, and we shall carefully avoid all matters of opinion, and confine ourselves strictly to matters of fact, of science, and of history—things provable and certain, and about which, though ignorance may be excusable, dogmatic ignorance is not.

On pp. 170 and 171 of this volume there is a discussion of the architecture of the Paris Opera-house, which contains the statement: "This front would have been more successful, perhaps, if these rounded pediments at either side of the second story had been half-domes, corresponding to the large half-dome in the centre of the building," etc. There is a *whole* dome over the auditorium, but no half-dome on the façade.

From p. 300 to 308 there is a brief history of painting, which is wholly delicious, but from which we will make but two extracts: "In the treatment of his [Lionardo's] coloring there was gradation, too, which had not been seen in the works of his predecessors"; and: "The foremost among these followers [of Rubens] were Van Dyck, . . . Teniers, . . . and Rembrandt"!

These are recondite matters of special knowledge. Let us take a matter or two of common observation: "Objects in sunshine at this time [noon] show bluish and cold tints; while those in shadow show the opposite" (p. 320). This will prove news to the painters of the open-air, as will the following upon aerial perspective: "As objects recede in the distance, they grow more dull in color, and, in the extreme distance, change their color, passing from one containing more light into one containing less light; bright red, for instance, passing into darker red and brown, yellow into orange," etc. (p. 321). One cannot argue with this, one can only tell Prof. Raymond that colors become paler in extreme distance, not darker. Having described a state of facts that does not exist, he gives as a reason for this state of facts another alleged fact which also does not exist. "These changes in colors take place in the distance," he says, "because less light falls upon the objects there"!

But it is in discoursing of the human eye, and of perspective, that Prof. Raymond is most astonishing. As proof that an image is actually formed upon the retina, he gravely says (p. 21): "Indeed, merely by looking into the eyes of our fellows, we can sometimes see in them an image of the external world as perfect as a reflection in a mirror." Since what we see *is* "a reflection in [or rather from] a mirror," this is hardly surprising, but what has it to do with the image on the retina? We can see the same thing on a glass, marble, or a brass ball. Does Prof. Raymond suppose that the reflection on the lens of a camera is the same thing as the image on the screen at the back? If he does, we recommend to his observation this simple distinction, that the image on the screen is upside down, while the reflection on the surface of the lens is right side up.

But the Professor is inexhaustible in this sort of thing. Hear him again. The eyes rotate, he says (p. 237), "whenever the axes of the two eyes converge—*i. e.*, whenever, in order to see distinctly and specifically, as distinguished from indistinctly and generally, the two eyes move away from each other—not towards each other, as some might suppose, forgetting that the lines of vision—*i. e.*, the axes—of the two eyes cross as they pass outward. See fig. 4, page 22." Fig. 4, being taken from Le Conte's 'Sight,' naturally shows nothing so absurd, and it represents only one eye. If, as a child, Prof. Raymond never held his finger in front of his nose in order to "look cross-eyed," let him try it now, and he can readily satisfy himself that, "in order to see distinctly and specifically," the two eyes do *not* "move away from each other."

Now hear the explanation of the perspective convergence of parallel lines: "They converge thus, of course, because the spherical shape of the eye causes the lines or axes of vision as they extend outward to radiate, and thus to render visible, when far enough away, not only an object which is exactly in front of the eye, but also much that is on both sides of this object" (p. 234). Starting with this radically false conception, we have a lecture on perspective which is wrong from end to end. "Horizontal lines," we are told (presumably lines parallel with the picture-plain, or, in other words, horizontal lines at right angles with the line of vision), "if above the level of the eye, will, at the place directly in front of us, curve upward in the image," and as an illustration of this: "In fig. 81, p. 155, the summits of the two steeples are on a level. A line drawn from one to the other is that which represents the horizontal; but notice, if actually drawn between them, what a

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sharp curve it would necessitate" (pp. 234, 236). On this the following observations may be made: (1.) No two points can possibly necessitate a curve as the line drawn between them. (2.) In the illustration, the front of the church is not at right angles to the line of vision, and is therefore in perspective without regard to the principle invoked. (3.) The illustration is from a photograph, and the camera is not spherical. Although it may surprise Prof. Raymond to be told so, it is nevertheless true that perspective has no more to do with the sphericity of the eye than with the theory of tides. Perspective is the mathematical projection upon a plane surface of solid objects beyond it; and whatever effect the sphericity of the eye may produce upon the image of the natural objects, it will also produce upon the image of the perspective representation. Therefore, lines straight in reality are properly represented by straight lines in art.

We pass from the question of Prof. Raymond's blundering as to facts, and give a specimen of his confusion of thought. The Greeks sometimes gave to both the stylobate of a temple and to the entablature an upward curve. Why?

"If, from a little distance, we look at a horizontal line before us and extending on both sides of us, in the degree in which this line is long its central point in front of us will seem to curve away from us, and, in the degree in which we stand lower than the line, it will curve *upward*. If this be true, it follows also that, in case a building be both above us and broad, and the centre of the horizontal line be not seen to curve upward, it will appear to do the opposite, that is, to curve downward. Again . . . a horizontal line appears to curve *downward*, when lower than the level at which the eyes are directed. When looking at a temple, they are instinctively directed towards some level above the stylobate; hence its platform would appear to sag downward if not slightly curved upward." (Pp. 255, 256. The italics are ours.)

Here is, indeed, a good rule that works both ways! Whether the line appear to curve upward or downward, the remedy is clearly proved to be the same. But one shudders for the intellect of the students in Prof. Raymond's classes, obliged to try to understand this explanation.

We do not pretend that these examples of blundering, false statements, and false reasoning, have been "chosen at random." On the contrary, we have carefully selected them as the most flagrant and the most easily exposed. There are many more, some of them only the more dangerous because less obvious; but it would take more time and space than the thing is worth to show them up.

VILLAGE LIFE IN CHINA.

Village Life in China: A Study in Sociology. By Arthur H. Smith. Fleming H. Revell Co.

This monograph of exceeding value is by a witty Yankee who has lived long in China. He has already written a book which, of all others in the library on China, best enables one to understand the Chinaman as he is. He acknowledges that the vastness of the country and the numbers of the race require one to be very modest when making generalizations. Yet his main conclusions are corroborated by those who have lived longest among the Chinese, dwelt with them in closest harmony, and succeeded in working with them with the most helpful results. After reading, we are impressed with the terrible facts that the average Chinaman has lost mental initiative, and that the moral forces which once shaped China, having utterly decayed, are to-day inert. The normal Chinaman, moulded by the influence of a millennium or two of traditions, never seriously disturbed, is incurious. He does not care. He will not be bothered by doing anything out of his routine. He does not want to know what happens in the next province, or the country beyond, or in the world. If, as in 1894, there is a war, not between Japan and China—for there never was such a thing—but between two or three Chinese provinces and the whole empire of Japan, the interior Chinaman has no interest in the matter, save as it may possibly, if the Japanese win, increase his taxes. Indeed, the only Chinese in the empire who are alert, inquiring, eager to know what the world is doing, and especially what China and the rulers of Peking are thinking of, are the converts—that is, the pupils of the missionaries or of those intelligent foreigners who have some other care concerning the Chinese servants than mere exaction of labor and payment of wages. Out of Chinese official life or from the literati it seems impossible to get honesty or virtue in any vital sense. The earnest, thinking men of China know that her vital lack is neither capital nor machinery, but men. They realize that the Chinese system does not produce men of conscience and of sterling character. They know that it has hitherto been impossible to secure any such persons, except by importation. How can it be otherwise in the future?

Dr. Smith's judgment is that of a cautious expert who has analyzed the Chinese social system and shown its issues and results: To the general reader and inquirer into sociology this book has the value which comes of a very minute, patient, and detailed study of a vital but much neglected subject. Most of the writing on China is like the big bulky thing itself, repulsive, monotonous, unrelieved by wit or a fine style. Dr. Smith has both. His special charm is that his fitly chosen words, usually taking their color from the Chinese background, brighten his pages, even as his wit and humor relieve their weight. He speaks of most efforts to get at the real population per square mile as "a mere pagoda of guesses." He declares that the "three harmonies," of Heaven, Earth, and Man are at present out of sorts with each other. "What is imperatively needed is a reconciliation. This can never be had until the Chinese come to a more accurate appreciation of the limits of the power of each of the triad." There are, on these lively pages, hundreds of quotable felicities which illustrate both the literature of knowledge and the literature of power.

Contrary to the notions of China current among us, the number of great cities is not, relatively to the whole population, anything like as large in China as in western lands. Even the district cities are often merely large villages. At least three-fourths of China is rural. When we think of the vast numbers isolated during tens of centuries from other lands and from the world, we need not wonder at the complexity and the conservativeness of Chinese civilization.

It would be hard to tell what the author does not describe in detail, for he ransacks the house and town. The one thing made clear is that for dulness and monotony Chinese villages may take the palm above all that exist in countries laying claim to civilization. He treats of construction, nomenclature, roads, ferries, wells, shops, theatres, schools, and colleges—mentioning the recent attempted reforms and the arrest of them by the Empress Dowager—temples and religious societies, coöperation in various forms, and social observances, such as weddings and funerals. Five chapters are devoted to village family life. This the author, with sympathy, but with a detail of knowledge that would delight a housekeeper, analyzes. He shows how morally impossible it is to expect reform and improvement of social life through the principles and system now in vogue. Yet, while making this judgment after long observation, accumulated data, and patient and impartial reasoning, Dr. Smith declares that, "in spite of all apparent evidence to the contrary, there is adequate reason to believe that Chinese social morality at its best is fully equal to that of any western land." One chapter is pathetic in its revelations as to the everywhere prevalent "instability from family disunity." He declares that the collocation of so many human beings in one compound family on the Chinese (or patriarchal) plan is one which no society in the world could endure, because it is more than human nature can bear. So long as this principle, which nominally holds many families under one head, exists, those perpetual Chinese quarrels which are so objectionable by reason of their suddenness, their violence, and their publicity, will continue to make life a needless burden, while the individuality and freedom absolutely necessary to progress will be kept in paralysis.

Very naturally the critic and intelligent reader turns with eager interest to the final chapter to learn the author's answer to the question, What can Christianity do for China? Here we are well rewarded, for we have the writing, not of an unseasoned zealot busy at oratory, with an eye to the secretary at home and to stimulating collections for foreign missions, but of a patient student, who, to long observation and wide experience, adds a knowledge of history. His belief in the potency of Christianity as that of "an unwasting and secular force" is based upon the conception of it as a moral power "producing certain definite, though small, results during a certain period of time, and of a nature adapted to produce indefinite similar results in unlimited time." So far from indulging in the rhetorical gush, so persistently and perniciously common, on which time has again and again set its ban of disapproval, Dr. Smith points out that under no circumstances can the moral power of Christianity produce its full effect in less than "three complete generations," by which time Christian heredity will have begun to operate. It would be well if both the promoters and the critics of Christian missions would keep this principle in view.

With clear apprehension of the difficulties, Dr. Smith points out how Christianity can improve the Chinese family—by demanding better care of children, creating more sympathy between parents and offspring, introducing training as well as government, revolutionizing the system of education, making the home as well as the school an ally, teaching the Chinese child his own tongue in a rational manner, rousing the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

conscience, and by providing intellectual and spiritual education for girls as well as boys. He believes that the education of Chinese women is one condition of the renovation of the empire. To-day the typical Chinese mother is "an ignorant woman with babies," but "no nation or race can rise above the status of its mothers and wives." Christianity will tend to a more rational selection of partners, will postpone marriage to a suitable age, and will make wedlock a sacred solemnity instead of a social necessity. By abolishing polygamy and concubinage, it will cut the taproot of a upas tree which now poisons Chinese society. At present the husband and wife are merely "commercial partners in a kettle of rice." By dividing the large compound family organization of the patriarchal type, it will leave each son free to work out his own destiny. It will introduce an entirely new element into the friendships of the Chinese, which are too often based upon the selfish considerations suggested by the maxim of Confucius, "Have no friends not equal to yourself"—against which the teachings of the New Testament run counter.

Searching history for precedents of conversions of empires, Dr. Smith reckons that, from the general opening of China, fifty years would suffice for a good beginning, three hundred for a general diffusion of Christianity, and five hundred for its obvious superseding of all rival faiths. Using a different forecast, however, he recalls the fact that spiritual development, like that of races, is slow in its inception, but, once begun, it takes little account of the rules of ratio and proportion. The forces of Christianity being now far greater than ever before, the world visibly contracted, and the age in which we live highly vitalized through communication and transfusion of forces, Dr. Smith sees the ultimate Christianization of China, believing such vision to be "sober history, rationally interpreted." With many questions and problems in China the all-comprehending problem is how to set Christianity at work among the Chinese.

Resurrection. By Leo Tolstoy. Translated by Mrs. Louise Maude. Dodd, Mead & Co.

Tolstoy's well-known views about the reconstruction of society through a general acceptance and practice of the teaching of Jesus Christ are very fully expressed in his latest work, 'Resurrection.' This teaching, the nations calling themselves Christian have long tacitly decided to be impracticable; yet it is perhaps natural that a man always profoundly interested in the riddle of life, pondering it chiefly amidst those social conditions which most put the profession of Christianity to shame, should, in his old age, demand nothing short of revolution and realization of a divine ideal. Tolstoy's belief that the revolution is always possible (flourishing as it does in defiance of most adverse conditions) is itself an evidence of controlling spiritual force, yet it seems more closely to ally him with the angels than with men, and is hardly an argument in favor of the perfectibility of common human nature. It does, however, add fervor to an appeal for similar faith, and force to those instances which he chooses for demonstration of the presence and power of God in man.

The method for developing his moral ideas that appears instinctively to have presented itself to him is at once philosophical and artistic. A question of conduct, of right and wrong, wide in application as human life, is discussed through a situation which has no exceptional features, and solved by the awakening of a soul which had long seemed dead, yet was only sleeping. In the first half of the book the Russian *milieu* imposes no local limitations; it is external and accessory, increasing the strain and pain of spiritual conflict, but never pinning us down to contemplation of a Russian soul. A wide generalization is perfectly comprehended in a special instance; the soul history of a world of men, having been searched and seen and understood without doubt, is finally cast, by a constructive imagination and a stern, impressive sort of literary art, into the story of Prince Dmitri Nekhludoff.

Tolstoy plunges into the story with the swift, dramatic stroke of a novelist so sure of his art that he feels no concern about it. In the first paragraphs God's beneficent intention is symbolized by the beauty of morning and spring, and man's stupid malevolence by the spectacle of soldiers with drawn swords conducting Maslóva, the prostitute, from prison to court, to stand her trial for robbery and murder. Maslóva's past is then sketched in a bare, direct way, an awful presentment of the havoc wrought by sexual passion. Society's injustice to women is marked by the picture of Nekhludoff, who has never been punished for the seduction of Maslóva, and who, during ten years of selfish and prosperous life, has managed to forget all about her. In describing the trial, Tolstoy lapses into bitter satire of processes and persons peculiarly Russian, but, with the recognition by Prince Nekhludoff, the juryman, of Maslóva, the criminal, he returns to his motive. Slowly, painfully, most reluctantly, Nekhludoff's atrophied soul awakes and forces him to see himself as the author of Maslóva's shame, to know that he in the first place is responsible for all that she has suffered from society and may yet be condemned to suffer by the law. After the awakening comes the battle, and the soul does not win in one dramatic moment. All the claims of the animal, of habit, of a great artificial society, are arrayed against it, but, in the end, the spirit does win, and the author vindicates his assumptions of the presence of God in man and the power of man to redeem himself.

When Nekhludoff voluntarily departs with Maslóva for Siberia, the moral idea seems to us to have been completely expressed, and the story told. But Tolstoy has still a great many social wrongs and abuses to condemn, and at this point he changes his method so absolutely that the change cannot be accidental. He may have felt that, so far, he has been delivering his message with too much art, too much technical skill; that, therefore, his sincerity may be questioned, and that, instead of working for serious moral regeneration, he has worked only for intense and transient emotional excitement. At all events, the rest of the book is fragmentary, the work not of a philosopher and novelist, but of a moralist and reformer seeing nothing in life but certain defined evils. The Russian dominates the man, and discussion of the universal spiritual gives way to denunciation of Russian class tyranny, official injustice, and very detailed accounts of the filth of Russian prisons. Nekhludoff, in journeying to Siberia, sharing the prisoners' hardships, listening to their tales, retires behind race barriers. With the destruction of artistic unity and force, the impressiveness of moral idea diminishes. By localizing the field for moral endeavor, the stimulus to that is minimized. We others cannot alter Russian society and cannot clean Russian prisons, therefore let us dismiss these startling pictures of hopeless misery from our minds as quickly as possible. It is true that we take leave of Nekhludoff announcing moral principles of general application; nevertheless, we feel that their practice may not be so imperative for salvation if we happen to have been born something less than a Russian prince.

Littérature Russe. Par K. Waliszewski. Paris: Armand Colin & Cie. 1900.

A History of Russian Literature. By K. Waliszewski. London: Heinemann; New York: Appletons. 1900.

Interest in Russian literature among English-speaking nations is not less extensive and genuine than among the Germans and the French, and the protagonists in the arena of Russian letters. Turgeneff, Dostoyevski, and Tolstoy have been accessible to English readers for a long time. More than thirty years ago Ralston laid even Russian students under obligations by his masterly study of Russian folklore, and of late similar discussions have appeared from the pens of Caster, Morfill, and Miss Hapgood. Yet, in spite of this intimate acquaintance of English scholars with literary Russia, no comprehensive work on its modern period has been written by an Englishman. The very thorough yearly reviews in the *Athenæum* have been furnished by the Russians Krapotkin, Milyukov, Bogdanovitch, while Prince Volkonski's 'Pictures of Russian History and Literature' is almost the only book that gives an authoritative view of the writers of the last thirty or forty years. It is, however, the reproduction of a series of public lectures which, notwithstanding their pleasant style, suffer from a prejudiced eclecticism such as might have been expected from the social position of their author.

It is, therefore, unfortunate that the latest work in the English language should not have proceeded from one who is either a native of the country under discussion, or intimately acquainted with the mental habits and literary traditions of the English race, but should be merely a translation from the French of a Polish historian who made France his home. Not that the book has no merits, for it is well written and is sufficiently complete for the English reader, but that it necessarily enlarges upon matters that must be foreign to the average Anglo-Saxon, and omits to enter into details as to which his ignorance demands especial enlightenment. If no original writer could have been procured to treat the subject, a mere compilation from the works of Pypin and Skabitchevski would have been more acceptable than this much-filtered work; for, though original and fairly just, it reflects too much the mind of a cosmopolitan, with a predilection for French letters, to be palatable to any but Frenchmen.

The historical treatment of the subject, and the short chapters into which the book is divided and subdivided, are to be highly commended; not less agreeable is the Bibliography attached to the work. Less laudable is the uneven, almost whimsical,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

treatment of the separate authors, of whom we have sometimes their entire biography, and again hardly anything but their names, though an equally close study was merited. The greatest faults are a too subjective attitude towards Russian literature, and the lack of sympathy with many of its productions. Thus, Waliszewski does not think it improper to insert an appeal of five pages to Tolstoy to desist from his religious propaganda and to stick to pure art. The 'Word of Igor's Armament' does not, according to him, deserve the high repute which it enjoys in Russia and elsewhere, but is nothing but a great abundance of forms with a complete penury of ideas. Turgeneff, too, is to be lowered in our estimation because there is not in his works a single female figure to be compared to Gretchen or Juliet. Gogol's 'Inspector' has no great value, and no originality whatsoever. These are all *dicta* with which not only Russians, but foreigners as well, cannot agree. Waliszewski's negative view of Russian letters arises mainly from his eagerness to explain them as imitations and reflexes of French and English originals. He scents now an influence of George Sand and Victor Hugo, now of Molière and Shakspere. But here he commits a grievous error. That Russian literature is not autochthonous, we stand in no need of his assurance. Besides, we have an admirable work by Veselovski in which due allowance is made for all Russian obligations to the literatures of the world. Had Waliszewski merely stated them, we should have no quarrel with him; we should rather have preferred to see the differences brought out more in relief than be compelled to dwell on the resemblances which are a matter of course.

Barring these serious defects, the book will perform a useful mission by directing attention to the whole field of letters, and will be especially appreciated by those who already possess some acquaintance with it, and who have studied the Russian mind from the works of Ralston, Wallace, and Vogüé.

The Moorish Empire: An Historical Epitome. By Budgett Meakin, for some years Editor of the *Times of Morocco*. London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co.; New York: Macmillan. 1899. Pp. xxiii + 576. Numerous illustrations, maps, and charts.

Did John Lackland really appeal for help to Morocco? Why did Chaucer's Knight go there, and where were those lists in which he fought for our faith? On what terms was Elizabeth with Morocco? We know how, to balance Spain, she coquetted—one of her multitudinous coquettings—with the Grand Turk. Does Cervantes speak in earnest or in irony where Don Quixote approves of the expulsion of the Moors from Spain? How did Morocco strike Addison's father when he was chaplain—an onerous task—to Kirke's Lambs in Tangier? Such links between land and land appeal to us all, but how much do we know in this case about the other end of the link?

This book gives us the other end, accurately yet without dryness or technicality, and is full of interest to any one who has interest in Europe. The first of three volumes which are intended to give a complete view of Morocco, historical, geographical, and sociological, it divides into three parts, (1) a history of the country from the time when it was Mauretania till now, when it still exists independently by grace of European squabbles; (2) a history of the external relations of the country, the corsairs and their Christian captives, Chaucer's Knight who had "riden in Belmarie" and other Christian soldiers of fortune, the long slow story of the gain by treaty of foreign rights and privileges; (3) a descriptive bibliography of all the books used by the writer, selected from Dr. Robert Brown's great 'Bibliography of Morocco.'

On Mr. Meakin's work as a whole there can be only one judgment. There was ample room and growing need for such a *Thesaurus Mauretanicus*, and, in spite of little defects here and there, the need has been fairly met. The style is rather lumbering in places and bears the stamp of the English provincial newspaper. Sometimes, too, the extreme compression of historical passages has produced obscurity. Of Muslim history outside of Morocco, and especially of the history of Muslim theology, Mr. Meakin has evidently not made any special study. Thus, his identification of the Shī'ites and the Mu'tazilites on p. 35 is a strange bit of confusion, and equally so his view of the Sunna on p. 38. We cannot believe that the word Sunnī is not known in Morocco nor the religious history which lies behind it; that it is of Persian origin, as we are told, is, of course, absurd. Further, some study of Goldziher's 'Zahiriten' would have put point into the notes on pp. 66 and 78; the omission is the more surprising in view of Mr. Meakin's general carefulness, and his knowledge of Goldziher's essay on the theology of Ibn Tūmart in *ZDMG*, xli. The system, too, of transliteration we have absolutely failed to fathom; yet it is explained in detail and with evident satisfaction. Whatever the system, certain words are evidently wrong in form.

But weakness in such details seems almost inevitable in English books, and is noticeable in this case only as the writer has made excellent first-hand use of the Arabic sources for the history of Morocco. He has also made use of two more recent Arabic historians, Ez-Zaïáni (whatever that form may stand for), whose work comes down to 1812, and an-Nāsirī, whose book (printed at Cairo in 1895) comes down to 1894. This latter historian has independent value for the period from 1812 down, and also for the last rulers of the Banū Marīn. From all these, and from his European sources, which are also excellent, Mr. Meakin has built up a masterly and exhaustive history of Morocco, which is unique outside of Arabic. He is not a simple compiler or chronicler, but has caught the methods of the scientific worker. From point to point the evidence of coins and inscriptions is used to check the written records, and European and Arabic sources are balanced one against the other. To the history an admirable chart of comparative chronology is prefixed, extending from the year 81 of the Hijra to the present time, on a scale of about one inch to the twenty-five years. Only those who have attempted something of the kind can know what labor this must have meant.

One of the best chapters is on the fate of the empire. The forces at work are clearly seen and impartially set forth. In intervention from without there can be little hope—there is no sympathy here with "the grasping heathenism miscalled patriotism"; and from within there is no hope—the Moors themselves are too well satisfied with things as they are. "According to native ideas, Morocco is, but for the absence of a really bloodthirsty Sultan who should make his subjects and all the world tremble, in a really prosperous and fortunate condition. Its only plague spot is the presence of the ever-multiplying Nazarenes." Yet, by the slow working of spiritual and educating forces, something may be accomplished. It is refreshing to hear a man who has the courage to speak out thus:

"It is a popular custom of travellers to disparage missionaries . . . Let their work be difficult, their faith a mockery to those who share it not, their object hopeless, their achievements insignificant, or, it may be, illusory; their faults apparent, their methods absurd: the missionaries, of whatever creed, are the noble few who live for the future, and no seed that they sow is lost. Every pure and earnest life lived, whether by a missionary or by any other, . . . will tell on the nation. Every foreigner who visits or resides in Morocco has a responsibility towards the Moors—a mission from God if he fears his God—a life to live, and a truth to proclaim in dealing with the natives, and on every one such, man or woman, hangs to some extent the fate of the Moorish empire."

We look with interest for Mr. Meakin's future volumes. They are certain to be good, but we would entreat him to reconsider his transliteration, either to explain it further or to abandon it altogether; and, above all, to give some time to Muslim theology and law. This last is imperative if his third volume, on things social and religious, is to rise to the true height of its argument.

Practical Agitation. By John Jay Chapman. Scribners.

It is hard to give an idea of the drift of this volume of essays except in the author's own language, and, as he very justly observes, every book wears a slightly different aspect to every new mind. But if we let him speak for himself, these essays "are an attempt to follow the track of personal influence across society." The results of the discussion are summarized in the concluding chapters, and, turning to these, the lesson which Mr. Chapman desires to enforce seems to be that influence on character is always a matter of character—virtue is "a mode of motion," by which virtue itself is transmitted from organism to organism; while vice is another mode of motion of an opposite kind. Hence, to accomplish practical ends by agitation, courage and sincerity are the mainsprings of any machinery that we set in motion, and with every concession to evil there is a loss of motive power. Nothing is needed to make the world perfectly good and happy but to observe that eternal law of agitation which Mr. Chapman preaches.

Stated in this way, the matter may seem self-evident; but, stated in Mr. Chapman's way, and with his unusual force of language and readiness of illustration, his exhortations appeal to the heart. This is because his application of the law of virtue is new and original. He applies it in the field from which our habit is to exclude it—that of politics. What do we need in politics? Obviously honesty, for, according to Mr. Chapman, we are at present engulfed in dishonesty.

"Well, what makes people honest? Honesty. Does anything else spread the influence of honesty except honesty? . . . You cannot imagine any situation where your own total force, in favor of honesty, will consist of anything else than honesty."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Then all we have to do is to be honest, and the Tammany-Platt world of which we are a part will be on its way to disappearance. On the other hand, do we wish to bolster up corruption? Invite Platt to breakfast; be seen "colloguing" with Croker. "Every little helps," in proportion to your influence. The moral law exists even in New York.

For consequences, as a true moral agitator Mr. Chapman cares nothing; he has the boldness to call attention to the fact which casuists have slighted, that though you may save a life by a falsehood, what you have promoted is life-saving, not truthfulness. Of course Mr. Chapman is extravagant. The man of the world, especially if he is concerned in political business, will resent what he says, the cynic will laugh over it; the young and inexperienced will be made hopeful by it. It is one-sided; it is paradoxical; it leaves out half of life; it takes no account of the circumstances, which proverbially alter cases; and it is the sort of thing we expect to hear in church, and not applied uncomfortably to journalism, or politics, or every-day life. Nevertheless, it is true.

The Management and Diseases of the Dog. By John Woodroffe Hill, Fellow of the Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons, etc., with illustrations. Fifth Edition; to which are added the standard of points for judging dogs, and a table of medicines and their doses. London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co.; New York: Macmillan.

This volume should be in the hands of every intelligent owner of a dog, as it is the work of an educated and practical man who is able to describe with simplicity and accuracy the causes, symptoms, and results of the great number of diseases to which dogs are subject. His advice for treatment and for the administration of medicines shows not only a knowledge of his subject, but a common sense and humanity not always in evidence in medical works. The arrangement is excellent, and makes it easy to find the particular thing one wants. The dog has long been, and is still to a great extent, left, when in need of intelligent care, to the mercies of such of the ignorant and vicious as have mostly proved themselves unfit for any other vocation. The possessor of Mr. Hill's book can find the most approved methods of treating any disease he is likely to meet in his canine household (and we learn there are thousands of them), and also is told the most sensible and rational methods of averting disease. The chapter on "rabies" is especially good, and while it does not attempt to give any cause for the malady except the bite of a rabid animal, states that there are undoubted cases of spontaneous generation. While undoubtedly "every dog has its day," the day is no more likely to be one of the dog days than any other day of the year, so far as going mad is concerned, and Mr. Hill also states emphatically that "the rabid dog never, in any stage of the disease, exhibits a dread of water; neither will the sight or sound of it produce spasms. On the contrary, thirst is present throughout." This chapter alone, in its destruction of popular fallacies, and in its minute description of the symptoms and treatment of the disease, is so truly useful that it should be in every family of a community in which dogs are kept, for one is quite as likely to be bitten by the mad dog of his neighbor as by his own, if not more so.

BOOKS OF THE WEEK.

An Equal Moral Standard for Men and Women: Paper read at International Council of Women. London: T. Fisher Unwin.
Baker, R. S. Our New Prosperity. Doubleday & McClure. $1.25.
Charlette, J. Millionnaire. Paris: Armand Colin & Cie. 3 fr. 50.
Gerrare, W. The Story of Moscow. London: J. M. Dent & Co.; New York: Macmillan. $1.50.
Hauff, W. von. Der Scheik von Alessandria und seine Sklaven. Macmillan. 60c.
Innes, A. D. Cranmer and the Reformation in England. Scribner. $1.25.
Jokai, M. A Christian but a Roman. Doubleday & McClure. 50c.
Newcomb, C. B. Discovery of a Lost Trail. Boston: Lee & Shepard. $1.50.
Raine, A. Garthowen: A Story of a Welsh Homestead. D. Appleton & Co. $1.
Stockton, F. R. Mrs. Cliff's Yacht. Scribner.
Thomas, H. W. The Last Lady of Mulberry: A Story of Italian New York. D. Appleton & Co. $1.50.

Henry Holt & Co.,

29 WEST 23D STREET, NEW YORK.

Have Just Published:

The second impression (the first was exhausted before publication) of a New Story by DAVID DWIGHT WELLS, *Author of* HER LADYSHIP'S ELEPHANT.

His Lordship's Leopard.

A Truthful Narration of Some Impossible Facts. 12mo, $1.50.

From The Nation's notice of Her Ladyship's Elephant:—"He is probably funny because he cannot help it . . . a benefactor of his kind."

HER LADYSHIP'S ELEPHANT (12mo, $1.25) is now in its tenth edition.

Recently Published:

The Courtot Memoirs.

12mo, $2.00.

A vivid description of events in France during the Terror and under the First Consul, and at the Court of Frederick William III. and Queen Louise in Prussia.

Outlook:—"This delightful Memoir. . . . Some of the most interesting impressions of the great ruler (Napoleon) which have yet appeared. The Memoir reads like a novel."

N. Y. Times' Saturday Review:—"It has all the charm of a good historical novel."

N. Y. Tribune:—"One of the strangest and most amusing books ever produced in the department of revolutionary literature."

The Harp of Life.

A Musical Novel. By ELIZABETH GODFREY, author of "Poor Human Nature." 12mo, $1.50.

Outlook:—"There are several characters of interest, and the somewhat unusual situations in which they are placed are handled in a clever and novel manner."

Nation:—"A pleasantly written novel. . . . It takes the reader placidly along through its bright and dark places, interested if not profoundly stirred."

Buffalo Commercial Advertiser:—"A thoroughly good, strong, pure story."

South Africa and the Transvaal War

By LOUIS CRESWICKE, author of "Roxane," etc. 6 volumes, each containing 8 colored plates, 8 portraits, 16 other illustrations of battles, views, etc., together with many maps and plans. Large 8vo, each volume complete in itself and sold separately, per volume, $2.50.

The volumes will form a permanent and historic record of the development of a great Colony under the British flag, and of the most momentous struggle in which Britain has been engaged since the Crimea.

G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS, 27 and 29 W. 23d St., N. Y.

Dr. Nansen's Polar Expedition.

The Norwegian North Polar Expedition.

1893-1896: Scientific Results.

Edited by FRIDTJOF NANSEN. Volume I. With 44 Plates and numerous Illustrations in the Text. Demy 4to, $15.00.

*** The aim of this report (which will be published in English only), is to give, in a series of separate Memoirs, a complete account of the scientific results of the Norwegian Polar Expedition, 1893-1896. The whole work is estimated to form five or six quarto volumes, which it is hoped will be finished in the course of about two years.*

NEW YORK:

LONGMANS, GREEN, & CO.

GEO. B. COCK,
Convention Stenographer,

14 So. Broad St., PHILADELPHIA.

TELEPHONE 1-42-25 D.

Reference, by permission, Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools of the Middle States and Maryland (Dr. Merrick Whitcomb, Secretary, Univ. of Pa.), whose conventions I have reported the last four years.

HATCHARDS.

This is the favorite BOOKSTORE, and for 100 years the resort of the smartest people in London. It is visited and patronized by all who love books. London is the great market for books, and all the best as well as the cheapest editions can be had by writing here. Special collections formed, and fuller information supplied than from any other house. Books, both old and new, and relating to any subject, can readily be supplied, at very moderate prices.

Agents for Clubs, Libraries, and all private collectors.

187 PICCADILLY, LONDON, W.

A NARRATIVE OF THE MUTINY ON BOARD H.M.S. BOUNTY.

By Lieut. WILLIAM BLIGH, with maps and charts. 12mo. Illustrated. $1.00.

A true narrative from the official report of Lieut. Bligh, who was in charge of the expedition.

COLLECTORS OF FINE EDITIONS,

and others interested in "Stevensoniana," Omar Khayyam, Tennyson and Ruskin, should send for the special announcements of The Bankside Press.

M. F. MANSFIELD, Publisher,
14 West Twenty-second St., New York.

TIFFANY STUDIOS

Illustrated Historical Booklets sent upon request—(1) *Favrile Glass*, (2) *Lamps and Fixtures*, (3) *Glass Mosaic*, (4) *Memorial Windows*, (5) *Memorial Tablets*, (6) *Monuments.*

333-341 FOURTH AVENUE, NEW YORK.

Languages Printing Company. Book and Magazine Work. Phonetic Texts, Technical and Educational Works, Examination Papers, Translating, Transliterating, Editing.
114 5th Avenue, New York.

BACK NUMBERS, VOLUMES, AND sets of the *Nation* bought, sold, and exchanged by A. S. CLARK, 174 Fulton st., N. Y. City.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

FICTION.
1,000 to 2,000 Words

Special Articles Illustrated.

Short Verse.

Are wanted for exclusive publication in

The Library.

Payment made on the Saturday following acceptance.

LIBRARY PUBLISHING CO.,
504 Penn Avenue,
Pittsburg, Pa.

NEW PUBLICATIONS IN FRENCH.

DOSIA.

By Mme. HENRY GREVILLE. With a Preface and Explanatory Notes by A. de Rougemont, A.M., late of the University of Chautauqua. 214 pages.

Is one of this well-known author's very best works, and a singularly bright and entertaining narrative.

12mo, paper, 60 cents; cloth, 85 cents.

Complete catalogue on application. For sale by all booksellers, or postpaid on receipt of price by the publisher,

WILLIAM R. JENKINS
851 and 853 6th Ave. (cor. 48th St.), New York

A New Novel by Gertrude Atherton

Senator North

Crown 8vo. Price $1.50.

This work is appearing serially in *The Times* (London). It is regarded by the author's admirers as her greatest book. Without doubt it will create deep interest in this country, and many readers of the serial predict for it the success of the year in fiction.

Other Novels by Mrs. Atherton:
"Patience Sparhawk" ($1.50), "The Californians" ($1.50), "A Daughter of the Vine" ($1.50).

JOHN LANE, 251 5th Ave., N.Y. City

Choice English and French Books

C. J. PRICE, 1004 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

Has always on hand a large collection of Choice and Rare English and French books, including Americana, Cruikshankiana, First Editions of Dickens, Thackeray, Leigh Hunt, etc. Drama. Best Editions of Standard Authors. Choicely Illustrated Works, etc., etc. The greater part of the collection are in fine bindings.

Monthly Select Lists sent to any address on application.

NEW TALMUD PUB. CO., 1332 Fifth Ave., N. Y.,

Invites the attention of those interested in the ancient Jewish Jurisprudence that vol. II. (10) "Baba Kama" (First Gate) of the English Talmud is now ready.

BOOKS, SECOND HAND AND NEW, Standard and Rare. Books bought. Catalogue Issued. E. W. JOHNSON, 2 E. 42d St., N. Y.

Houghton, Mifflin and Company's

NEW BOOKS

THE MISSISSIPPI VALLEY IN THE CIVIL WAR

By JOHN FISKE. With 23 Maps, several of them colored. Crown 8vo, $2.00.

Mr. Fiske here brings his breadth of view, his rare appreciation of the orderly movement of history, and his singular power of clear description and charm of narration to setting forth the course and significant events of the Civil War in the Mississippi Valley.

THE CONCEPTION OF IMMORTALITY

Being the Ingersoll Lecture for 1899. By JOSIAH ROYCE, Professor in Harvard University and author of "The Spirit of Modern Philosophy," "The Religious Aspect of Philosophy," etc. 16mo, $1.00.

A strong and ingenious argument for human immortality as the permanence of the individual man.

THE BURDEN OF CHRISTOPHER

By FLORENCE CONVERSE, author of "Diana Victrix." Crown 8vo, $1.50.

Is a story of modern business life, its sharp competitions, and the many conditions of temptation and trial which confront a man who seeks to do business in a just and honorable way. These conditions impose the burden which Christopher bears; and the story of his burden and the bearing of it, with the sweet domestic story running through it—these make a book of uncommon interest and significance.

THE ARTS OF LIFE

By R. R. BOWKER. 16mo. $1.25.

Mr. Bowker's object in this book is to promote a greater wholeness and symmetry in living—to show that life need not be so fragmentary, so made up of unrelated aims and activities, as it generally is, that it should be systematically right and in a high sense artistic.

THE CAMBRIDGE SCOTT

The Complete Poetical Works of Sir Walter Scott. *Cambridge Edition.* With a Biographical Sketch, Notes, Indexes, a Portrait, and an engraved title-page with a vignette. Large crown 8vo, $2.00; half calf, gilt top, $3.50; tree calf or full levant, $5.50.

Sold by all booksellers. Sent, postpaid, by

HOUGHTON, MIFFLIN & COMPANY, Boston.
11 East 17th Street, New York.

BOOKS AT LIBERAL DISCOUNTS.

When calling please ask for MR. GRANT. Whenever you need a Book, address MR. GRANT.

Before buying books write for quotations. An assortment of catalogues and special slips of books at reduced prices sent for 10-cent stamp.

F. E. GRANT, Books,
23 W. 42D ST., NEW YORK.
(Mention this advertisement and receive a discount.)

F. W. CHRISTERN

(DYRSEN & PFEIFFER, Successors),

429 5th Ave., bet. 38th and 39th Sts., New York. Importers of Foreign Books; Agents for the leading Paris Publishers; Tauchnitz's British Authors, Teubner's Greek and Latin Classics. Catalogues of stock mailed on demand. New books received from Paris and Leipzig as soon as issued.

ELLIS & ELVEY,

Dealers in Old and Rare Books.

CATALOGUES of CHOICE BOOKS and ILLUMINATED MANUSCRIPTS published periodically.

Rare Early English Literature, Early Printed Books in Black Letter, Ancient Artistic Bookbindings. Rare Prints and Autographs, etc. Only fine specimens are dealt with.
29 NEW BOND STREET, LONDON, ENG.

BOOKS.—All out-of-print books supplied, no matter on what subject. Write us. We can get you any book ever published. Please state wants. When in England call and see our 50,000 rare books. BAKER'S GREAT BOOKSHOP, 14-16 John Bright Street, Birmingham, England.

A DAY IN ANCIENT ROME.

By EDGAR S. SHUMWAY, Ph.D., Professor in Rutgers College. Is in its 42d thousand. Price, cloth, 75c.; paper, 30c.

D. C. HEATH & CO., Publishers, Boston, New York, Chicago.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED